



U.S. Department of  
Transportation

**FEDERAL AVIATION  
ADMINISTRATION**  
Washington, DC 20591

---

**FINAL REGULATORY EVALUATION,  
REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY DETERMINATION,  
INTERNATIONAL TRADE IMPACT ASSESSMENT,  
AND UNFUNDED MANDATES ASSESSMENT**

**FINAL RULE**

**TITLE 14 CFR PARTS 121, 139**

**CERTIFICATION OF AIRPORTS**

Office of Aviation Policy and Plans,  
George A. Euring, Jr.  
August 29, 2002

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary .....	1
I. Introduction.....	4
II. Background .....	7
III. Summary of the Final Rule .....	13
IV. Benefits of the Final Rule .....	23
V. Cost Estimates for the Final Rule .....	42
VI. Benefits-Costs Summary .....	77
VII. Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis .....	80
VIII. International Trade Impact Assessment .....	85
IX. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act .....	86
<u>Appendices</u> .....	87

III-1	Final Rule Class I Airports, March 2001
III-2	Final Rule Class II Airports, March 2001
III-3	Final Rule Class III Airports, March 2001
III-4	Final Rule Class IV Airports, March 2001

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

On June 6, 2000, the FAA published a Notice of Proposed Rule Making (NPRM), titled Certification of Airports, Docket No. FAA-2000-7479. The NPRM proposed to revise the current airport certification regulation (part 139 of Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations) and to establish certification requirements for airports serving scheduled air carrier operations in aircraft designed for more than 9 passenger seats but less than 30 passenger seats (small air carrier aircraft). A corresponding amendment to an air carrier operation regulation, part 121, also was proposed.

The NPRM was accompanied by the economic analysis that was titled, Initial Regulatory Evaluation, Regulatory Flexibility Determination, International Trade Impact Assessment, and Unfunded Mandates Assessment, For Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, Title 14 CFR Parts 121, 139, Certification Of Airports. This Final Regulatory Evaluation updates the Initial Regulatory Evaluation on the basis of the comments received and modifications to the rule made by the FAA. This update examines the economic impacts of this rule on approximately 565 civilian airports currently certificated under part 139 and approximately 37 airports that are not certificated and serve scheduled small air carrier operations. The FAA did not analyze the rule's economic impact on the approximately 91 Department of Defense airports that will no longer be certificated under part 139 but will continue to serve air carrier operations.

After considering the alternatives for the certification of airports serving small air carrier operations and alternatives for updating part 139, the FAA has determined that this rule is necessary to ensure safety in air transportation. The last major revision of

part 139 occurred in November 1987. Since then, industry practices and technology have changed significantly. Further, in 1996, Congress authorized the FAA to certificate airports serving scheduled air carrier operations conducted in 10 to 30 seat aircraft, except in the State of Alaska, to ensure safety in air transportation. This was the same year that all occupants died in a collision of a United Express Beech 1900C (under 30 seat air carrier aircraft) and a Beech King Air aircraft (a general aviation aircraft) at the Quincy Municipal Airport, Illinois. The National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) concluded that if on-airport emergency services that are required under part 139 had been required for this operation, “lives might have been saved”.

Based on comments received on the NPRM, the FAA made a number of revisions to the proposed part 139 requirements, and these revisions will result in the reduction of the final rule costs as compared to the NPRM. These revisions include the extension of compliance times; elimination of certain conditions for obtaining an exemption from aircraft rescue and firefighting (ARFF) requirements; elimination of certain emergency planning and training requirements; and expansion of procedures for the use of contractors to comply with part 139 requirements. However, these costs savings are offset by a change to the number of affected airports; adjustments to cost estimates based on comments received from airport operators; and to a lesser extent, by revisions to proposed requirements, such as additional record keeping requirements.

Although the total cost of the rule over a ten-year period could be as low as \$55.06 million, the FAA has been conservative in its cost estimates and has generally accepted alternative, but higher, cost estimates provided by airport operators, even though most of these airport operators assumed that compliance with the rule would

require certain actions that the FAA does not believe would actually be required. Using these alternative cost estimates, the FAA estimates present value of the total cost of the final rule over a ten-year period is approximately \$73.4 million – a 60 percent increase over the estimated total cost of the NPRM. The FAA believes this total cost is low compared to resources and assistance available to airport operators.

The expected benefit of the final rule is enhanced safety at all certificated airports. This is particularly true at the newly certificated airports that are serving certain scheduled passenger flights but have not been subject to Federal airport safety regulations. The FAA believes that compliance with part 139 requirements will reduce the potential for accidents by ensuring a consistent and safe operating environment for air carrier passengers and other airport users. Further, in the event of an aircraft accident, part 139 requirements will help to reduce fatalities, injuries and property damage of an expected one and possibly two or more accidents. As noted above, the total cost estimate is conservative and does not include a host of policies and available funding designed to reduce the compliance cost of the final rule. Consequently, and in view of the moderate costs and potential benefits, the FAA concludes that the benefits of the final rule justify the costs.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, part 139 (part 139) requires airport operators to comply with certain safety requirements prior to serving certain air carrier operations. These requirements cover a broad range of airport operations, including the maintenance of runway pavement, markings and lighting, notification of air carriers of unsafe or changed conditions, and preparedness for aircraft accidents and other emergencies. How an airport operator complies with these requirements is specified in the operator's airport certification manual (ACM) that is approved by the FAA. When an airport operator satisfactorily complies with its ACM, the FAA issues to the airport operator an airport operating certificate (AOC). The FAA periodically inspects these airports to ensure continued compliance with part 139 requirements.

In June 2000, the FAA proposed to revise certain part 139 safety requirements and require the certification of airports not currently certificated that serve scheduled air carrier operations conducted in small air carrier aircraft. The proposal also clarified existing requirements, incorporated existing industry practices, and responded to an outstanding petition for rulemaking and certain NTSB recommendations. Further, it proposed to revise the existing airport certification process to incorporate all airports covered by the statute, including those serving scheduled, smaller air carrier aircraft. Based on comments received, the FAA has revised the proposal and issued a final rule.

Prior to the changes to this rule taking effect, the FAA issued two types of certificates depending on the type of air carrier operations an airport served. Airports that serve *scheduled* operations of large air carrier aircraft (more than 30 seats) were issued an AOC. As these airports regularly serve large air carrier operations, they

must fully comply with all part 139 requirements. Of the approximately 565 certificated civilian airports, approximately 430 airports hold an AOC.

Airports serving only unscheduled operations of large air carrier aircraft were issued a Limited Airport Operating Certificate (LAOC) and required to develop and implement a limited ACM, known as the Airport Certification Specification.

Approximately 135 airports hold an LAOC. Air carrier operations in large aircraft are so infrequent at these airports that, consequently, they must comply only with portions of part 139. For example, existing § 139.213 requires airport operators holding an LAOC to comply with only certain pavement, lighting, marking, and emergency response requirements. Airport operators holding an LAOC are typically located in smaller communities or support seasonal activities, such as skiing during winter months.

The final rule will require the approximately 565 civilian airports that currently hold an AOC or an LAOC to be certificated and comply with revisions to part 139. This would generally require only amendments to the ACM. However, approximately 45 of these airports also could be required to implement certain safety measures on a more frequent basis to cover any small air carrier operations that do not occur concurrently with large air carrier aircraft operations.

Airports that are not certificated and desire to continue serving small air carrier aircraft will be required under the final rule to apply for an AOC, develop and implement an ACM, and comply with certain part 139 safety and operational requirements.

In addition, the final rule clarifies that airports operated by the United States government, including the Department of Defense (DOD), are not subject to part 139. Consequently, approximately 91 DOD airports currently certificated under part 139 will

no longer need to be certificated under part 139 even if these airports continue to serve air carrier operations.



## **II. BACKGROUND**

### **A. Regulatory History**

Since 1970, the FAA Administrator has had the statutory authority under Title 49, United States Code (U.S.C.) § 44706 to issue airport operating certificates to airports serving certain types of air carriers and to establish minimum safety standards for the operation of those airports. The FAA uses this authority to establish requirements for the certification and operation of certain land airports through 14 CFR part 139.

Until 1996, FAA's authority to certificate airports was limited to those land airports serving passenger operations of an air carrier that is conducted with an aircraft having a seating capacity of more than 30 passengers. In response to recommendations made by the General Accounting Office (GAO) in 1987 and the National Transportation Safety Board NTSB in 1994, the Secretary of Transportation sought authority from Congress to broaden this authority. However, FAA's authority was not broadened until Congress enacted the Federal Aviation Administration Reauthorization Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-264) amending 49 U.S.C. 44706. This amendment granted FAA the authority to certificate airports serving scheduled air carrier operations conducted in aircraft with more than 9 seats, but less than 31 seats (small air carrier aircraft), except in the State of Alaska. There was no change to FAA's existing authority to regulate airports serving air carrier operations using aircraft with more than 30 seats.

In April 2000, Congress mandated, in the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (AIR 21; Public Law 106-181), that FAA issue a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) within 60 days, and a Final Rule 1 year after the close of the NPRM comment period implementing 49 USC 44706(a)(2), relating to

the issuance of airport operating certificates for small scheduled passenger air carrier operations.

FAA implemented its new authority regarding airport certification by publishing an NPRM on June 21, 2000 (65 FR 38636). This NPRM proposed to revise the current airport certification requirements in 14 CFR part 139 and established certification requirements for airports serving scheduled air carrier operations in aircraft with more than 9 seats, but less than 31 seats. A conforming amendment to 14 CFR part 121 was also proposed in the NPRM. The public comment period was originally scheduled to close on September 9, 2000; however, the comment period was extended to November 3, 2000, in response to several requests made by airport operators and the State of Maine.

As discussed earlier, the FAA proposed in the NPRM to revise and update certain safety requirements and require certification of airports not currently certificated that serve scheduled air carrier operations conducted in aircraft with more than 9 passenger seats but less than 31 passenger seats. The proposal also clarified existing requirements, incorporated existing industry practices, and responded to an outstanding petition for rulemaking and certain NTSB recommendations.

#### **B. General Accounting Office Report (1987)**

In 1987, the General Accounting Office (GAO) issued a safety report on the certification of small airports<sup>1</sup>. The report concluded that airport safety would be enhanced if all airports serving scheduled air carriers were certificated and recommended that the FAA include such facilities in its airport certification program.

---

<sup>1</sup> Aviation Safety: Commuter Airports Should Participate in the Airport Certification Program, US General Accounting Office, GAO/RCED-88-41, November 1987.

The FAA concurred with the GAO's findings, but determined that its statutory authority was limited to airports that serve scheduled and unscheduled passenger operations of air carrier aircraft with more than 30 seats. A proposed amendment to broaden this authority was submitted to Congress, but the measure was not enacted.

**C. National Transportation Safety Board Study (1994)**

In November 1994, the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) released its findings resulting from a study of commuter airline safety.<sup>2</sup> (Note: The term commuter, when it appears in this study, refers to the use of this term before March 20, 1997. As of March 20, 1997, the term commuter refers to an aircraft or operations conducted in an aircraft, which has 9 or fewer passenger seats.) This study identified several safety improvements that the NTSB felt would improve the commuter airline safety record.

While this study, and subsequent recommendations, focused on airline and aircraft operations, it was also critical of the FAA for not requiring airports serving small air carrier operations to maintain their facilities in the same manner as airports serving major air carriers.

**D. The Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee**

The FAA approached the question of the certification of airports that serve scheduled operations conducted in small air carrier aircraft by requesting the assistance of the Aviation Rulemaking Advisory Committee (ARAC). The ARAC was established by the FAA to provide advice and recommendations to the FAA Administrator concerning a range of the FAA's rulemaking activity, including air carrier operations, airman certification, aircraft certification, airports, security, and noise.

---

<sup>2</sup> Safety Study: Commuter Airline Safety, National Transportation Safety Board, NTSB/SS-94/02, November 1994.

To assist in the certification of airports serving small air carrier aircraft operations, the FAA requested the ARAC's advice and recommendations on what requirements should be applicable to airports that have scheduled service with aircraft having a seating capacity of 10-30 seats [60 FR 21582, May 2, 1995]. In developing these recommendations, the FAA asked the ARAC to consider alternatives to minimize the operational burden on smaller facilities, including options for aircraft rescue and firefighting services. The FAA also suggested the ARAC conduct a survey of affected airports to gauge the impact of any proposed requirement. At the time of this request, the FAA did not have the statutory authority to regulate airports serving scheduled operations conducted in small air carrier aircraft.

The ARAC accepted this task and established a Commuter Airport Certification Working Group to develop recommendations on this issue. Comprised of members of the main committee, the working group's membership included representatives from the following organizations:

1. Air Line Pilots Association
2. Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association
3. American Association of Airport Executives
4. National Air Transportation Association
5. National Association of State Aviation Officials
6. Regional Airline Association

The FAA and Landrum and Brown, an airport planning and engineering consulting firm, also provided technical support.

Over the course of a year, the Commuter Airport Certification Working Group met five times to research the issue and develop recommendations for the ARAC. The working group initially endeavored to establish a voluntary industry standard consistent with the FAA's lack of authority to regulate airports serving commuter operations. However, after the passage of Public Law 104-264, the FAA requested the working group to expedite its report and to take a regulatory approach to the certification of airports serving small air carrier aircraft. This action was based on the FAA's decision to exercise its new authority to regulate airports serving small air carrier operations.

While the working group agreed on many issues, a minority disagreed with several of the group's recommendations. This minority differed on six regulatory requirements, including marking and lighting; aircraft rescue and firefighting; and handling of hazardous substances and materials. Subsequently, the working group developed both a majority and minority position at the FAA's request. Individual working group members also provided comments on issues when their respective organizations differed from the position taken by the working group.

In February 1997, both the majority and minority views of the working group, and those of individual group members, were presented to the FAA. Overall, the working group majority recommended that a non-regulatory approach to improve small air carrier airport safety could accomplish the same level of safety as regulating these airports. In light of the proposed rulemaking, the majority suggested that such a regulation should focus on accident prevention rather than accident mitigation, particularly in light of the limited public funds available to these small airports.

As requested by the FAA, the working group also conducted a survey of airports that might be affected to determine what safety practices are already being conducted and the potential operational and economic impact if these airports were to comply with existing part 139 requirements. This survey requested information on rescue and firefighting capabilities, airport staff, certification status, annual enplanements, existing marking, lighting and signs, and capital and recurring costs of certain equipment and procedures. The results of this survey are included with the ARAC final recommendations on commuter airport certification, filed in the public docket. These survey results are also discussed in the IRE and the final rule's Discussion of Comments section.

### **III. SUMMARY OF THE FINAL RULE**

#### **A. Introduction**

As discussed earlier, the FAA is issuing a final rule that revises and updates certain part 139 safety requirements and requires the certification of airports that serve scheduled air carrier operations conducted in small air carrier aircraft and are not certificated by the FAA. The final rule also clarifies existing requirements, incorporates existing industry practices, and responds to an outstanding petition for rulemaking and certain NTSB recommendations. Further, it revises the existing airport certification process to incorporate all airports covered by the statute, including those serving scheduled, smaller air carrier aircraft.

Instead of differentiating between an AOC and a LAOC and creating additional types of Airport Operating Certificates, the final rule revises the certification process by requiring only one type of airport operating certificate, an AOC, and only one type of certification manual, an ACM. All airport certificate holders will be required to adopt and implement an ACM, regardless of size and type of air carrier operations. However, all certificated airports will be divided into classes and ACM requirements will vary for each airport classification.

Certificated airports are now divided into four new classifications, Class I-IV, based on the type of air carrier operations served. Class I airports serve the largest and most varied types of air carrier operations and are required under the final rule to comply fully with part 139 requirements. Requirements for the remaining airport classifications vary according to the type and frequency of air carrier operations served, as described below.

Under the final rule, already certificated airports will be reclassified as Class I, II and IV airports and will be required to comply with additional or revised part 139 requirements that will require some amendments to their ACM. All airport operators certificated under this final rule will be issued a new AOC. This will not require currently certificated airports to reapply for an AOC but submit a revised ACM as appropriate. The FAA will convert existing certificates. However, airports that will be newly certificated under the final rule will need to apply for an AOC.

Approximately 436 civilian airports that currently hold an AOC will be reclassified as Class I airports. The remaining certificated airports will be classified as either Class II or Class IV airports. Approximately 121 currently certificated airports will be classified as Class II airports and approximately 15 currently certificated airports will be classified as Class IV airports.

Airports that are not certificated and desire to continue serving small air carrier aircraft (approximately 37 airports) will be required under the final rule to apply for an AOC, develop and implement an ACM, and comply with certain part 139 safety and operational requirements.

In addition, the final rule clarifies that the approximately 91 airports operated by the United States government, including the Department of Defense (DOD), are not subject to part 139 even if these airports continue to serve air carrier operations.

Finally, the FAA has revised the part 139 to clarify and update several requirements to better reflect current industry practices and technology. These changes will apply to all airports certificated under part 139 and will generally require currently



certificated airports to only take administrative action. These changes include updates or clarifications of:

- Recordkeeping requirements;
- Personnel training requirements;
- Hazardous material storage requirements, specifically fuel dispensing and storage safety procedures;
- Aircraft rescue and firefighting (ARFF) training and hazardous material response requirements; and
- Emergency plan requirements.

As noted above, in addition to serving unscheduled operations conducted in large air carrier aircraft, approximately 120 of the 135 airports holding a LAOC (Class II airports) also serve scheduled operations conducted in small air carrier aircraft. To address these additional operations, this final rule requires these 120 airports to implement existing safety measures (such as aircraft rescue and firefighting) on a more frequent basis and comply with additional safety requirements.

This final rule will require the remaining 430 certificated civilian airports (Class I airports) to continue to comply with all existing part 139 requirements. In addition, these airports will be required to revise their certification manuals and comply with final modifications to existing requirements. Approximately 45 of these airports also could be required to implement certain safety measures on a more frequent basis to cover any small air carrier operations that do not occur concurrently with large air carrier aircraft operations.

Also, this final rule will clarify that airports operated by the United States government, including DOD, are not subject to part 139. Consequently, all airports certificated under this final rule will be issued new Airport Operating Certificates. This will not require currently certificated airports to reapply for an Airport Operating Certificate. When this final rule is adopted, the FAA will convert existing certificates, as appropriate.

**B. Airport Certification Classification**

This change to the certification process will still distinguish between airports that serve different sizes or types of air carriers, and establish requirements appropriate for each type of airport. Under this final rule, similar airports will be grouped together into four new categories, Classes I-IV, and a separate set of requirements is required for each new airport class, as follows:

1. Class I Airport: Airports serving all types of scheduled operations of large air carrier aircraft, and any other type of air carrier operations, will be known as Class I airports. All airports with an existing AOC will become Class I airports.

2. Class II Airports: Class II airports will be those airports that serve scheduled operations of small air carrier aircraft (10-30 seats) and unscheduled operations of larger air carrier aircraft (more than 30 seats). Airports that will be classified as Class II will be airports with an existing LAOC that serve scheduled operations conducted in small air carrier aircraft.

3. Class III Airports: Class III airports will be those airports that serve only scheduled operations conducted in small air carrier aircraft. Class III airports will be those airports newly certificated as the result of this rulemaking.

4. Class IV Airports: Class IV airports will be those airports currently with a LAOC that serve only unscheduled air carrier operations conducted in large air carrier aircraft (more than 30 seats).

**C. Airport Certification Manual (ACM) Requirements By Class**

The FAA currently requires airports to develop an ACM or ACS, depending on the type of certification, to detail how the airport will comply with the requirements of part 139. As every airport is unique, the final requirements have sufficient flexibility to allow the tailoring of the final requirements to the unique circumstances of each airport. The FAA sets forth performance-based standards that airports implement, through the ACM/ACS, in the manner best suited to their facilities. In this manner, the FAA can vary and tailor airport requirements to accommodate local conditions.

Under the final rule, only one type of certification manual, an ACM, is required and the requirements for manual content will vary among the categories, with the most comprehensive manual being required of Class I airports. Class I airports will have to comply with more safety requirements than Class II, III, and IV airports as they serve more complex and varied air carrier operations.

**D. Airports Affected**

All currently certificated civilian airports will be affected by the final rule (approximately 565 airports). In addition, an estimated 37 currently uncertificated civilian airports that serve scheduled operations of small air carrier aircraft, will be affected. In the future, any airport operator wishing to serve scheduled operations conducted in small air carrier aircraft, or both scheduled and unscheduled operations conducted in large air carrier aircraft, must be certificated.

An estimated total of approximately 600 civil airports will be affected by the final rule. The total number of certificated airports varies during the course of the year due to seasonal activities or fluctuations in air carrier service.

A list of airports to be certificated under the final rule, classified by new airport classes, is shown in Appendices III-1 through III-4. These appendices categorize airports that currently hold an Airport Operating Certificate, or will be newly certificated under this final rule, as follows.

1. Appendix III-1 shows a list of the Class I airports by state. There is an estimated total of 436 Class I airports.
2. Appendix III-2 shows a list of the Class II airports by state. There is an estimated total of 112 Class II airports.
3. Appendix III-3 shows a list of the Class III airports by state. There is an estimated total of 37 Class III airports.
4. Appendix III-4 shows a list of the Class IV airports by state. There is an estimated total of 18 Class IV airports.

**E. Comparison of Existing and Final Airport Requirements**

Tables III-1 through III-4 show the existing and final airport certification requirements for each final airport class.

<b>Table III-1</b> <b>Current Requirements and Adopted Revisions for Class I Airports</b>		
Class I Airports are existing certificated airports holding an Airport Operating Certificate that serve scheduled operations of large air carrier aircraft (more than 30 seats), and any other type of air carrier operation.		
	<b>Current Requirements</b>	<b>Adopted Revisions</b>
1.	Personnel provisions	A recordkeeping system and new personnel training standards
2.	Paved and unpaved surfaces	Unchanged
3.	Safety areas	Unchanged
4.	Marking, lighting and signs	Unchanged
5.	Snow and ice control plan	Unchanged
6.	ARFF	New recurrency training, fire extinguishing agent and HAZMAT response standards, and increase in frequency of ARFF coverage (where ARFF is not provided for small air carrier operations)
7.	HAZMAT handling/storage	Standards for air carrier fueling operations, and new fuel safety and personnel training standards
8.	Traffic/wind indicators	New supplemental wind cone/segmented circle standards
9.	Airport emergency plan (AEP)	New requirement to plan for fuel storage fires
10.	Self-inspections	New training requirements for inspection personnel
11.	Ground vehicle operations	New training requirements for pedestrians and ground vehicles
12.	Obstructions	Unchanged
13.	NAVAIDS	Unchanged
14.	Public protection	Unchanged
15.	Wildlife hazard management	New wildlife strike reporting, hazard assessment and management plan standards
16.	Airport condition reporting	New notification standard
17.	Construction/unserviceable areas	Unchanged

<b>Table III-2</b> <b>Current Requirements and Adopted Revisions for Class II Airports</b>		
Class II Airports are existing certificated airports holding a Limited Airport Operating Certificate that serve scheduled operations using small aircraft (10-30 seat), in addition to serving unscheduled large air carrier aircraft (more than 30 passenger seats).		
	<b>Current Requirements</b>	<b>Adopted Revisions</b>
1.	Personnel provisions	New requirement for recordkeeping system and personnel training
2.	Paved and unpaved surfaces	Unchanged
3.	Safety areas	Unchanged
4.	Marking, lighting and signs	Unchanged
5.		New requirement for snow and ice control plan
6.	ARFF (negotiated standard)	New requirement to comply with ARFF standards (per §§ 139.315-.319)
7.	HAZMAT handling/storage (negotiated standard)	New requirement to comply with HAZMAT handling/storage standard (per § 139.321)
8.	Traffic/wind indicators (negotiated standard)	New requirement to comply with traffic/wind indicators standard (per § 139.323)
9.		New requirement for AEP (no triennial exercise required)
10.	Self-inspections (negotiated standard)	New requirement to comply with self-inspection standard (per § 139.327)
11.		New requirement for ground vehicle operations
12.		New requirement for obstructions
13.		New requirement for NAVAIDS
14.		New requirement for public protection
15.		New requirement for wildlife hazard management
16.	Airport condition reporting	New notification standard
17.		New requirement for construction/unserviceable areas

<b>Table III-3</b> <b>Current Requirements and Adopted Revisions for Class III Airports</b>		
<p>Class III Airports will be newly certificated under this rule, and will serve scheduled operations of small air carrier aircraft (10-30 seats). These airports cannot serve scheduled or unscheduled operations of large air carrier aircraft (more than 30 seats).</p>		
	<b>Current Requirements</b>	<b>Adopted Revisions</b>
<b>1.</b>	None	A recordkeeping system and personnel training
<b>2.</b>	None	Paved and unpaved surfaces
<b>3.</b>	None	Safety areas
<b>4.</b>	None	Marking, lighting and signs
<b>5.</b>	None	Snow and ice control plan
<b>6.</b>	None	ARFF
<b>7.</b>	None	HAZMAT handling/storage
<b>8.</b>	None	Traffic/wind indicators
<b>9.</b>	None	AEP (no triennial exercise required)
<b>10.</b>	None	Self-inspections
<b>11.</b>	None	Ground vehicle operations
<b>12.</b>	None	Obstructions
<b>13.</b>	None	NAVAIDS
<b>14.</b>	None	Public protection
<b>15.</b>	None	Wildlife hazard management
<b>16.</b>	None	Airport condition reporting
<b>17.</b>	None	Construction/unserviceable areas

<b>Table III-4</b> <b>Current Requirements and Adopted Revisions for Class IV Airports</b>		
<p>Final Class IV Airports are existing certificated airports holding a Limited Airport Operating Certificate that serve <u>unscheduled</u> operations of large air carrier aircraft (more than 30 seats). These airports cannot serve <u>scheduled</u> large, or <u>scheduled</u> small (10-30 seats) air carrier aircraft.</p>		
	<b>Current Requirements</b>	<b>Adopted Revisions</b>
1.	Personnel provisions	New requirement for a recordkeeping system and personnel training
2.	Paved and unpaved surfaces	Unchanged
3.	Safety areas	Unchanged
4.	Marking, lighting and signs	Unchanged
5.		
6.	ARFF (negotiated standard)	New requirement to comply with ARFF standards (per §§ 139.315-.319)
7.	HAZMAT handling/storage (negotiated standard)	New requirement to comply with HAZMAT handling/storage standard (per § 139.321)
8.	Traffic/wind indicators (negotiated standard)	New requirement to comply with traffic/wind indicators standard (per § 139.323)
9.		New requirement for an AEP (triennial exercise not required)
10.	Self-inspections (negotiated standard)	New requirement to comply with self-inspection standard (per § 139.327)
11.		
12.		
13.		
14.		
15.		
16.	Airport condition reporting	New notification standard
17.		



#### **IV. BENEFITS OF THE FINAL RULE**

##### **A. Introduction**

The expected benefit of this final rule is improved aviation safety resulting in reduced fatalities, injuries, and property damage at airports with scheduled air carrier operations, particularly those operations conducted in small air carrier aircraft. This final rule affects all currently certificated airports and the estimated 37 additional airports that may choose to obtain certificates. Accordingly, benefits are expected to accrue at all four final classes of certificated airports.

The revision of part 139 standards and the inclusion of additional airports in the airport certification program are expected to prevent accidents and collisions resulting from non-standard or inadequate compliance with part 139 safety and operational requirements. Uniform standards, such as required for runway and taxiway markings, signs and lighting, help reduce the possibility of confusion and misunderstanding and directly contribute to improving airport safety. For example, existing runway safety area requirement that ensure aircraft that run off the runway can come to a stop without running into obstacles or terrain, has already mitigated what could have been a serious air carrier accident at currently certificated airport. In addition, snow and ice removal and wildlife hazard management requirements prevent accidents by eliminating hazards that aircraft could strike while arriving or departing the airport.

Further, emergency response requirements, including the requirements to develop and implement an airport emergency plans and to provide ARFF services, have and will mitigate future accidents by saving passenger lives and reducing property damage.

While the benefits are easy to identify, a precise measure of these benefits is difficult. For instance, the FAA expects that the wildlife requirement will reduce the number of wildlife strikes to aircraft. This reduction in wildlife strikes at just Class III airports can result in a benefit from approximately a million dollars to \$10 million or more. Unfortunately, the uncertainty of the methods that airport operators will use to mitigate wildlife hazards make it difficult to calculate a useful net benefit estimate for wildlife hazard management requirements. However, the quantitative benefit estimate of the ARFF requirement alone nearly justifies the entire compliance cost of the final rule.

The expected benefit of avoiding an accident involving a 30 passenger seat aircraft with 60 percent occupancy at a Class III airport is \$63 million. Using a Poisson distribution, the FAA believes that this expected value could underestimate the actual number of such accidents. There is a 26 percent probability of two or more accidents with a potential value well in excess of \$100 million.

#### **B. General Discussion Of Expected Benefits**

Most part 139 requirements fall under the risk reduction category, as these requirements are intended to decrease the possibility of an accident by providing a safe and standardized operating environment. Such requirements include, but are not limited to, the marking, lighting, and maintenance of runways and taxiways; removal and marking of hazards in aircraft movement areas; maintenance of traffic and wind indicators, and regular facility inspections.

These requirements promote the consistent application of safety measures and ensure a common and reliable operating environment at all airports. Although most

airports affected by the rule currently meet these standards, a few (approximately 9 airports) will need to be upgraded. The FAA believes this will make a significant contribution to safety, for example, by helping to reduce the persistent problem of runway incursions.

Similar to air traffic control procedures, if pilots and other airport users can come to expect the same facilities, procedures and equipment at every airport at which they operate, then many of the uncertainties and miscommunications that can cause accidents are avoided. The FAA believes that requiring covered airport operators to establish and document how they comply with risk reduction requirements in their ACM will achieve consistency in the daily application of such procedures, and ensure consistency during changes to airport personnel or management.

The remaining part 139 safety and operational requirements are considered to be accident mitigation requirements as they are intended to minimize the consequences of an aircraft accident. Requirements for aircraft rescue and firefighting and emergency planning are examples of accident mitigation requirements that are included in this category. To save passenger lives and property, prevent injury to responding personnel and protect the traveling public from unsafe conditions, the FAA believes that airports serving air carriers should be adequately prepared to respond to aircraft accidents and other airport-specific emergencies.

While catastrophic aircraft accidents that the final rule is intended to prevent or mitigate do occur, they have been rare events. This was particularly true of small air carrier operations, in large part, because they have comprised a small portion of commercial air passenger activity. However, such accidents do occur and if the

provisions of the rule prevent or mitigate the consequences of one catastrophic accident involving an aircraft with 30 passenger seats, the potential benefit of lives saved and property damage avoided could be as much as \$99 million. If it prevents an accident associated with the collision of two of these aircraft the benefit will double to as much as \$198 million. Potential safety benefits are not limited to situations involving small air carrier aircraft, but extend to large air carrier aircraft and general aviation.

Part 139 requirements also help reduce and mitigate other types of air carrier accidents. Between 1997 and June 2002, the NTSB investigated 11,562 accidents/incidents, of which 1,343 occurred at or near airports certificated under part 139 and 67 occurred at or near airports newly certificated under the final rule. Aside from the rare major accidents noted above, most of these accidents/incidents are comprised of aircraft sustaining property damage as the result of colliding with other aircraft, construction or service equipment, airport vehicles and wildlife or aircraft that due to mechanical problems or pilot error land short of the runway or unintentionally depart the runway during take off or landing rollout. The FAA believes the number and the severity of these accidents/incidents are minimized at certificated airports because compliance with part 139 requirements ensures a safe and consistent operating environment and emergency response services, including ARFF, are readily available.

Some of these incidents/accidents are the result of runway incursions. The FAA defines a runway incursions as “any occurrence at an airport involving an aircraft, vehicle, person or object on the ground that creates a collision hazard or results in a loss of separation with an aircraft taking off, intending to take off, landing, or intending to land.” Runway incursions are tracked only at airports with FAA air traffic control towers

and these towers are located at approximately one-half of the airports certificated under part 139. From January 1997 to June 2002, air traffic control towers at airports certificated under part 139 reported 1,510 runway incursions.

Under the final rule, Class II, III and IV airports will be required to comply with certain safety requirements for the first time that will help to reduce runway incursions by ensuring a safe and consistent operating environment. Of these runway incursions, 117 incursions occurred at 52 towered airports that would be required under the final rule to comply with additional safety requirements (Class II and IV airports) and newly certificated airports that would comply with part 139 safety requirements for the first time (Class III airports). The other 121 Class II, III and IV airports that do not have an air traffic control tower also experience runway incursions.

For instance, Class III airports are required under the final rule to internally illuminate mandatory holding position signs. These signs indicate to pilots the location on the taxiway where to stop until cleared by the air traffic control tower to proceed onto the runway. These signs can be readily seen at night and during low visibility conditions when internally illuminated. In addition, these airports will be required to conduct daily self inspections to ensure that all safety measures required by part 139, such as runway and taxiway markings, signs and lights, are functioning properly and provide accurate information to pilots, thereby reducing confusion over an aircraft's location on the airport or taxiing route, thereby helping avoid runway incursions.

In addition to benefiting air carriers and their passengers, the FAA believes the final rule will benefit other airport users and the general public. For example, general aviation aircraft also use, at most airports, areas used by air carrier aircraft, such as

runways, taxiways, and ramps. Such areas are usually better maintained and equipped than similar areas at airports serving only general aviation aircraft. General aviation aircraft operators also benefit from emergency response services, daily safety inspections, and airport condition reporting provided at airports certificated under part 139. Also, air carrier passengers, in the terminal building and in parked aircraft benefit from the availability of part 139 required firefighting and emergency medical services.

In consideration of all benefits of the final rule, the FAA has determined that the expected benefits of the rule justify the costs as described in the succeeding sections.

### **C. Specific Discussion of Expected Benefits**

Analysis of air carrier accident data revealed benefits of compliance with part 139 requirements that can be quantified in terms of lives saved, injuries prevented and the reduction of property damaged. The following 139 requirements were identified in this analysis as preventing (or having the potential to prevent) or mitigating the negative effect of an accident or incident on passengers and property:

#### **1. Runway Safety Areas**

An example of a safety benefit from a risk reduction requirement of this final rule relates to runway safety areas. A runway safety area is a designated area surrounding a runway that is intended to reduce damage to an aircraft that lands short of the runway or inadvertently leaves the runway. The final rule requires that operators of all certificated airports keep the runway safety area level and clear of obstacles and hazards to aircraft. Safety equipment that must be in the runway safety area, such as lights and navigational equipment must be installed on frangible hardware that allows

the equipment to break away if hit by an aircraft. In addition, certain arresting materials may be installed in the runway safety area if physical limitations of airports, such as a river adjacent to a runway, prevent a standardized runway safety area.

On May 8, 1999, a SAAB 340 overran a runway at New York's John F. Kennedy International Airport. However, the airport had recently installed arresting material in order to comply with part 139 safety area requirements and the airplane stopped 50 feet short of Thurston Bay. The incident resulted in very little damage to the aircraft and one minor passenger injury. A previous incident on the same runway in 1984, before the safety area was improved, resulted in an SAS DC-10 running into the bay, resulting in multiple passenger injuries and extensive airplane damage.

This final rule will impose the safety areas requirements of part 139 on Class III airports for the first time. These airports have been encouraged to install safety areas for over 10 years, and many have done so through Federal airport funding programs. Although the final rule will not mandate immediate installation of these safety facilities at any class of airports, the FAA believes that, over time, the eventual installation or improvement of safety areas at certificated airports will greatly increase safety in air transportation.

## 2. Emergency Response Services and Equipment

Another important safety benefit of this final rule is more widespread availability of emergency response services and equipment. These services are used to respond to airport emergencies, including aircraft accidents, medical emergencies in the terminal building and aircraft fueling fires or spills.

Part 139 accident mitigation requirements provide a comprehensive response to aircraft accidents, and other emergencies. For example, required alarm and communication systems ensure that both ARFF and airport personnel are notified promptly of an accident, and alert other necessary emergency service providers in the local community (i.e., paramedic, police, ambulance service and hospitals). Similarly, accident mitigation measures ensure other needed emergency services are provided, including security and crowd control, removal of disabled aircraft and other debris from movement areas, transportation and facilities for uninjured and injured persons, and storage of deceased persons. All of these measures contribute to a comprehensive emergency response that mitigates the loss of passenger lives and property, prevents injury to responding personnel, and protects air carrier aircraft and the public from unsafe conditions.

There is ample evidence that part 139 accident mitigation requirements can save lives and reduce injuries. Perhaps the clearest example of that was an accident that occurred at Los Angeles International Airport on February 1, 1991. This tragedy involved the collision of a US AIR 737-300 and a Skywest Metro on Runway 24L. The crew and 10 passengers on the Metro were killed, as were some of the crew and 20 passengers on the 737-300. However, the NTSB credited the part 139-required emergency response for saving lives.

As noted earlier, over a five-year period 1,343 accidents/incidents occurred within a five-mile radius of airports certificated under part 139. Most of these accidents only involved aircraft sustaining property damage. This damage was the result of aircraft colliding with other aircraft, construction or service equipment, airport vehicles



and wildlife or aircraft that due to mechanical problems or pilot error land short of the runway or unintentionally depart the runway during take off or landing rollout. The following are examples where the actions of part 139 emergency response services and equipment mitigated such property damage:

- Lawton – Ft Sill Regional Airport (5/24/1998). An Embraer Bandeirante in air carrier service lost an engine on takeoff. Immediately after takeoff, the aircraft began losing altitude, struck the ground, and came to rest 1,600 feet from the runway. Passengers and rescue personnel removed the pilot and one passenger from the airplane, and ARFF personnel extinguished the post crash fire.
- Miami International Airport (12/1/1998). A fire broke out while a Boeing 747-200F was being refueled. Responding ARFF personnel extinguished the fire.
- Bradley International Airport (1/21/1998). An ATR 42-300 experienced an engine fire during the landing rollout. Responding ARFF personnel extinguished the fire.
- Nashville International Airport 7/8/1996. A Boeing 737-200 aborted takeoff after the left engine ingested a bird, and came to rest beyond the runway. Responding ARFF personnel extinguished a fire that erupted in the right brake assembly.
- Miami International Airport (10/23/1995). A Boeing 747-121 experienced an uncontained failure of No. 4 engine during takeoff roll. The takeoff was rejected and the airplane was stopped on the remaining runway. Responding ARFF personnel extinguished a fire that subsequently erupted in the failed engine.

- Philadelphia International Airport (8/17/1995). A SAAB SF-340-A experienced a fire near the left engine while waiting to take off. Responding ARFF personnel extinguished the fire.
- Greater Peoria Memorial Airport (7/17/1991). An ATR-42-300 experienced a failure of the left engine followed by engine fire while on final approach. The pilot made a normal landing and conducted an evacuation on the runway. Responding ARFF personnel extinguished the fire.

In addition, ARFF services are alerted and deployed when there is a perceived risk of an accident. For example, emergency personnel will don protective clothing and position ARFF vehicles close to the runway if alerted by air traffic control that an inbound aircraft is experiencing problems. Further, ARFF services are used to respond to other airport emergencies involving air carrier aircraft and passengers, such as medical emergencies in the terminal building and aircraft fueling fires or spills. The FAA has tracked those incidents at currently certificated airports, and notes that over 1,200 such occurrences took place during an 18-month period.

A major safety provision of the final rule is that it will require the availability of emergency response services and equipment at every landing and takeoff of scheduled air carrier aircraft with 10 to 30 seats. This capability is required now for air carrier operators with more than 30 seats, and, as discussed earlier, there is evidence that lives have been saved and injuries prevented or reduced as a result. In some cases, this protection may not currently be available for small aircraft operations at airports served by large air carrier aircraft. For example, an accident that occurred at Quincy,

Illinois (a Class I airport) on November 19, 1996 might have been mitigated had ARFF been on site during the departure of a small air carrier aircraft.

This accident involved the collision of a United Express Beech 1900C (a small aircraft) and a Beech King Air (a general aviation aircraft) during the ground operations of the two aircraft. These aircraft collided at the intersection of two runways. At the time of the accident, there were no large air carrier aircraft operations in progress or imminent, and, consequently, the airport operator was not required to provide emergency response services, and these services were not on the site. When required, emergency response services, including ARFF, were provided by the Quincy Fire Department, whose personnel would come to the airport from an offsite location to staff emergency equipment during the operations of large air carrier aircraft. All 10 passengers and 2 crew members aboard the United Express Beech 1900C and the two occupants aboard the King Air were killed as a result of post crash fires.

The NTSB found that the speed with which the fire enveloped the King Air, and the intensity of the fire, precluded the survivability of the occupants. However, the occupants of the Beech 1900C did have the opportunity to escape, but could not open external doors that might have been damaged. The NTSB concluded, "if on-airport ARFF protection had been required for this operation at Quincy Airport, lives might have been saved." (NTSB Aircraft Accident Report—*Runway Collision United Express Flight 5925 and Beechcraft King Air A90-Quincy Municipal Airport, Illinois-November 19, 1996*—NTSB AAR-97/04, P.51.)

Based on this accident history, a simple risk assessment provides a reasonable quantified estimate of the potential value of part 139 emergency response requirements.

The final rule will extend these emergency services to passengers traveling in air carrier aircraft with 10 to 30 passenger seats. For an accident in a 30 passenger seat aircraft occupied at 60 percent of capacity (the industry average), the expected benefits equal \$63 million based on 21 potential prevented fatalities (18 passengers and three crew members) multiplied by \$3 million per prevented fatality. While \$63 million is the expected benefit, using the Poisson distribution with a mean of one accident over a ten-year period, there is a 26 percent chance of two or more such accidents with a value in excess of \$100 million.

### 3. Fuel Storage Fires

An expected benefit of the final rule is the prevention/mitigation of fuel storage fires. The final rule requires all classes of airports to address such fires in their disaster plans. This will better prepare airports to prevent and/or extinguish the kind of fire that occurred at Stapleton International Airport, Denver, Colorado, on November 25, 1990. That fire erupted in a fuel farm fire about 1.8 miles from the main terminal and burned for 48 hours, destroying about 3 million gallons of fuel. No lives were lost in this fire, but flight operations of a major air carrier were disrupted for lack of fuel and the carrier estimated total damage to have reached between \$15 and \$20 million.

Airport firefighters and the Denver Fire Department promptly responded to the fire and attacked it immediately. However, because the firefighters were unable to maintain a continuous flow of foam on the fire, it reignited and quickly intensified. Airport and local firefighters did not have, nor could they have been expected to have, a sufficient supply of foam concentrate to fight a full fire of such magnitude. The Denver

fire burned for about 48 hours before being extinguished by a coordinated attack using outside resources and materials.

The NTSB concluded that the City and County of Denver (the airport certificate holder), and the fire department in particular, apparently had not considered the possibility of a fire of this type since no procedures or contingency plans were in place for dealing with one. The FAA believes that a requirement to have effective contingency plans could have resulted in the fire being extinguished much sooner, resulting in considerably less damage.

This final rule will require several improvements to the already existing requirement for airport emergency plans. Under the final rule, Class II, III, and IV certificated airports will be required to develop and implement such plans, and all classes will be required to include provisions for responding to fuel farm fires. The costs of this final rule requirement are low—a few hundred dollars, annually, for each certificated airport. Although the risk of fire is always present at fuel facilities, required precautions make the probability of a fire very low. The FAA believes that this low-cost provision of the final rule has a high probability of significantly mitigating damage if a fire comparable to Denver's occurs in the future.

#### 4. Snow and Ice Control

Another safety benefit is expected from improved snow and ice control, which will reduce the potential for the following kind of accidents. On March 17, 1993, a BAC-BA-Jetstream 3101 was making a night instrument approach to the Raleigh County Memorial Airport in Beckley, West Virginia, a Class II airport. Because the runway was

not properly plowed, and berms of snow concealed the runway lights at ground level, the captain lost control after touchdown, and the airplane sustained substantial damage.

This final rule requires Class II and III airports to develop snow and ice control plans. Although some of these airports already have individually developed procedures for snow and ice removal, this final rule will formalize consistent plans across all airports with scheduled air carrier services. The FAA determined that this low-cost requirement to standardize response to snow and ice will significantly help prevent the kind of accident discussed above.

#### 5. Wildlife Hazard Management

Finally, substantial benefits are expected at all classes of certificated airports as a result of actions to reduce wildlife hazards (bird strikes and other damaging collisions with wildlife). An FAA study of civil aircraft wildlife strikes in the United States (“Wildlife Strikes to Civil Aircraft in the United States, 1990 – 1999”) found a significant and growing hazard of wildlife contact with aircraft in the vicinity of airports. The study determined that 92 percent of all wildlife strikes occur while arriving or departing from an airport. Birds were involved in 97 percent of the reported strikes, mammals (primarily deer and coyotes) in 3 percent and reptiles, such as turtles, in less than 1 percent. The number of annual reported strikes increased 181 percent between 1990 and 1999, and, according to the FAA report, is now causing about \$391 million per year in direct costs.

The study further found that there were 4,529 wildlife-aircraft strikes reported during the period 1991-1997 that damaged aircraft components. The study estimated that the report rate was about 20 percent of what actually occurred. Based on its

findings, the report concludes that airport operators need to be aware of the wildlife hazards on their airports and take appropriate actions to minimize the problems.

The expected benefit of this section of this final rule is the reduction of wildlife hazards to air carrier operations. Airports not currently certificated by the FAA are not required to meet part 139 wildlife hazard management requirements. At some of these airports, wildlife hazards already exist that under the final rule will require the airport operator to conduct a wildlife assessment and possible the implementation of a wildlife hazard management plan. The expansion of wildlife hazard management requirements to these airports is intended to ensure that all airport certificate holders serving scheduled air carriers address wildlife hazards in a consistent and effective manner. Accordingly, the FAA expects to reduce the number of wildlife strikes that will otherwise occur.

While it is possible to generate high preventable cost estimates from wildlife strikes, the potential range of the net benefit estimate is too wide to be of practical help because the full cost of preventing such strikes is not known and the full cost of preventing wildlife strikes itself has a wide range. Resolution of airport wildlife hazard problems typically involves some combination of habitat modification, resource protection, and population management. Habitat modification involves eliminating food and water sources and shelter that is attracting wildlife. Resource protection uses physical barriers, chemical, audio, or visual repellents to deny wildlife access to the area of concern. Population management involves controlling the number and distribution of wildlife on or near the airport by non-lethal and lethal means.

However, to provide an example of possible benefits resulting from wildlife hazard management requirements, the FAA has developed an estimate for Class III airports. Based on the current reporting data it is possible to assess the cost of wildlife strikes for Class III airports. The FAA has received wildlife strikes reports from 17 of the 39 Class III airports. Of these strike reports, 9 were classified as substantial. A substantial classification means that the aircraft incurs damage or structural failure, which would normally require major repair or replacement of the affected component. Based on the total of wildlife strikes report between 1991 and 1997 (4,529 reports) and the \$78.3 million cost estimated for these strikes, the average cost of a wildlife strike to an aircraft is \$17,000. Then the estimated aircraft damage cost of these 9 strikes is \$153,000.

If the 20 percent under reporting is accurate for the currently non-certificated airports (Class III airports), the wildlife strikes at Class III airports may have resulted in aircraft damages as high as \$765,000. For one of these airports, a wildlife strike was reported to have destroyed a Cessna 310 aircraft (resale price ranges from \$70,000 to \$125,000). Given the high value of aircraft, the cost of a destroyed aircraft can easily raise this cost estimate to well over a million dollars.

When an aircraft is less than 500 feet above the ground traveling at well over 100 miles an hour, a wildlife strike can result in passenger death or injuries. Two examples of this are an accident involving an Embraer 120RT that hit two deer while landing at Yeager Airport (CRW) (a Class I airport) at Charleston, WV and the accident of an Learjet that hit two deer on a runway at Troy, AL (a general aviation airport).



According to the NTSB Aviation/Incident Database Report (NYC01LA054, 12/06/2000), on December 6, 2000, an Embraer 120RT, N504AS, operating as Atlantic Southeast Airways flight 71, was substantially damaged when it collided with deer, just after landing at Yeager Airport (CRW), Charleston, West Virginia. The 3-person crew and 15 passengers were uninjured, and 1 passenger received serious injuries. According to the captain, within seconds of landing, the airplane struck two deer. The flight attendant then contacted the cockpit crew, and informed them that there was an injured passenger. After parking at the gate, a walk-around inspection revealed that the tip of a propeller blade from the number 2 engine had separated, and had punctured the airplane's fuselage. According to a Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) inspector, one of the deer was hit by the nose landing gear, and the right engine propeller hit the other deer.

The other accident involving a LearJet LJ-60 occurred on January 12, 2001 (NTSB Aviation/Incident Database Report, ATL01FA021, 1/14/2001). The aircraft, operated by Ark-Air Flight Inc., collided with two deer during landing and ran off the end of the runway at the Troy Municipal Airport, in Troy, Alabama. The pilot and first officer received serious injuries, and the aircraft was destroyed by the impact and the subsequent post impact fire. According to witnesses, the airplane collided with the deer shortly after touchdown and continued down the runway with the brakes on and departed the right side of the runway near the end, crossed a taxiway and impact into a ditch and burst into flames. Local rescuers were able to extricate the crew before the fire engulfed the cockpit.

Between 1991 and 1997, there were 10 reported wildlife strikes involving 19 passenger seat Beech-1900 aircraft (22 potential total occupants). The FAA values each prevented fatality to be \$3 million. FAA cost estimates for injuries range from \$38,500 for a minor injury to \$521,800 for a serious injury. With the growth in certain wildlife population as well as aircraft operations, it is likely that without mitigation the past 10 or more wildlife strikes will reoccur at Class III airports, impacting 10 to 130 aircraft occupants. It is not unreasonable to expect that 10 percent of these occupants will incur minor to serious injury and that several may die as result of a wildlife strike. The FAA estimates that the minimum potential averted cost is several hundred thousand dollars; yet just one fatal accident raises the preventable cost to \$3 million.

With the structured approach of the final rule to resolving wildlife strikes to aircraft, it is very reasonable to expect that each airport solution will be one where the benefits exceed the costs, and in some cases, the net benefit may be substantial. Airport improvements to reduce wildlife hazards will ultimately provide a safer environment for all civil aircraft operations. Given the growing population of certain wildlife, the increasing number of aircraft operations and the history of reported wildlife strikes, potential benefits for just the newly certificated airports (37 Class III airports) range from a low of several million dollars (from damage and injuries avoided) to an estimate in excess of \$10 million.

The benefits of the wildlife strike provision of the final rule extend beyond all Class III airports to all certificated airports. However, the uncertainty of both the rule effectiveness and the total compliance cost of preventing wildlife strikes

forestall a reasonable range estimate of net benefits. It is very reasonable to expect that wildlife preventative action at each certificated airport will have benefits in excess of costs with system-wide benefits in the millions.

## **V. COST ESTIMATES FOR THE FINAL RULE**

### **A. Introduction**

The cost estimates for the final rule are based on those presented in the initial regulatory evaluation (IRE) for the NPRM adjusted for the changes resulting from an updated count of airports and from comments received on the NPRM. The FAA has been conservative in its cost estimates and has generally accepted alternative cost estimates provided by airport operators, even though most of these airport operators assumed that compliance with the rule would require certain action that the FAA does not believe would actually be required. The documentation of the earlier cost estimates, data sources, and methodology per section of the NPRM are fully discussed in the IRE.

This section presents the changes in the IRE cost estimates, the reason for those changes, and the resulting total cost estimate for the final rule. Changes to the NPRM cost estimates by risk reduction and mitigation cost categories are first discussed for Class I, II and IV airports and then for Class III airports. Tables V-1 and V-2 detail the changes in risk reduction and mitigation costs for Class I, II and IV airports, including initial, recurring and total cost estimates for each of these airport classes. In Tables V-3 and V-4, airport specific risk reduction cost estimates for each potential Class III airport are provided. Mitigation costs for each Class III airport are provided in Table V-5.

Based on comments received on the NPRM, the FAA made a number of revisions to the proposed part 139 requirements. These revisions are expected to result in the reduction of the final rule costs when the final rule is implemented. However, these cost savings are offset by a change to the number of affected airports (due to

changes in air carrier service); adjustments to cost estimates based on comments received from airport operators; and to a lesser extent, by revisions to requirements.

The IRE estimated the average cost of compliance per requirement for each of the proposed four airport classes. The reason the FAA used an average cost per rule provision by airport class is that each of the approximately 600 affected airports is unique in geography, facilities, and service provided. Final rule costs also assume that all covered airport operators will comply fully with part 139 requirements. This may not always occur as the FAA has the authority to exempt airport operators from certain requirements that are too burdensome or impractical and can tailor compliance for each airport operator to accommodate variations in airport layouts, operations and air carrier service. Such variances make it difficult to determine actual costs for each individual airport operator. In developing an average cost for each airport classification, the FAA assumed the highest possible compliance cost to ensure all potential costs are addressed, even though the final rule allows the FAA the flexibility to tailor compliance procedures or grant an exemption from certain requirements.

## **B Analysis of Economic Comments on NPRM**

Most of the regulatory evaluation comments received were airport specific and the FAA has accepted the alternative cost estimates provided in these comments. The FAA used two approaches to modifying the cost estimates based on alternative cost data provided by commenters. Given the limited number of comments received from Class I, II and IV airports, especially considering the total number of these airports, the FAA largely accepted and adjusted the alternative cost estimates only for the individual

airport referenced in the comment. As a result, changes to cost estimates were relatively minor for Class I, II and IV airports.

Conversely, the FAA revised the estimated compliance costs for all Class III airports based on comments received and developed airport-specific costs for each potential Class III airport. This was necessary to comply with the statutory requirement to analyze the potential impact of this rule on air carriers serving Class III airports. Of the 37 Class III airports, 14 of these airports provided economic comments that the FAA generally used, even though most of the commenters assumed that compliance with the rule would require certain actions that the FAA does not believe would actually be required. Nearly all of the resulting changes to Class III airport cost estimates are attributed to comments received regarding the availability of existing airport personnel to comply with new requirements.

Based on comments received, the FAA made the following changes to the rule language. The changes were designed to make it easier for airports to comply and to reduce compliance costs.

1. Compliance times were increased, including staggered compliances times for emergency planning and response;
2. The ARFF exemption process was revised to eliminate the need for the airport operator to provide alternative timed response, equipment, or personnel requirements;
3. Training requirements were narrowed to only those persons with access to movement areas rather than all airport personnel;

4. Procedures to permit use of an outside organization to comply with part 139 were expanded to cover any requirement of part 139;
5. The annual training requirement for emergency medical personnel was deleted (frequency will be determined by state or local licensing authorities);
6. The emergency medical services requirement was clarified to allow for non-ARFF personnel to provide such services:
7. Safety procedures for storing, dispensing and handling aircraft lubricants and oxygen were eliminated;
8. Requirements for locating and lighting wind and traffic indicators were revised to allow the use of existing indicators;
9. Requirements for airport emergency planning were revised to limit emergency preparedness to the largest aircraft served rather than the largest aircraft that might use the airport.
10. Qualifications were modified for a wildlife biologist that can be used by the airport operator to comply with wildlife hazard management requirements;
11. The requirement to comply with certain wildlife hazard management standards was revised to consider the type and number of air carrier operations;
12. The types of runway and taxiway signs that must be reported when malfunctioning were limited to mandatory holding position signs and a system-wide failure; and

13. The requirement for reporting air carrier operations at low activity airports was deleted.

Additionally, changes were made to reduce training and recordkeeping requirements based on comments that raised concerns about the cost to comply.

**C. Cost Mitigating Factors**

Part 139 requirements among the four classes vary according to the type and frequency of air carrier operations served. The cost analysis of the IRE and the Final Regulatory Evaluation considers this variation. However, this cost analysis does not address the flexibility the FAA has to tailor compliance procedures or grant an exemption from certain requirements to accommodate variations in airport layout and operations or lack of local resources. Accordingly, the cost estimates for each airport classification will be higher than the FAA anticipates will be the actual cost to comply with part 139. While airport operators that choose to be certificated under part 139 will be required to document procedures for complying with part 139 and to comply with certain safety and operational requirements, the FAA's ability to tailor compliance for each airport will permit certificated airports flexibility in complying with the more burdensome requirements.

The cost analysis also considers the infrastructure and resources available to airports to assist complying with part 139, particularly airports that could be newly certificated and serving small air carrier operations (approximately 37 airports). A good portion of the total rule cost can be attributed to these airports. While these airports have already accepted \$187 million in Federal funds for airfield safety enhancements, they are not at the same level of compliance as airports already certificated under part



139 and may need to expend more resources to comply with the rule than already certificated airports.

Cost estimates for airports serving smaller air carrier operations assume that these airports will comply with part 139 in manner similar to other certificated airports. However, in some instances the cost to comply with certain part 139 requirements could be too burdensome for these airports. The FAA initiated this rulemaking fully appreciating the financial limitations of these airports and intends to work with them to tailor compliance with part 139 to ensure the most cost effective and flexible method to enhance safety at all certificated airports. In addition, the FAA will assist airport operators to obtain additional Federal funds, as appropriate. If Federal, state and local funding is not adequate, the FAA will seek alternative means of compliance with part 139 requirements or will use its statutory authority to grant exemptions from requirements that would be too costly, burdensome, or impractical.

At approximately two-thirds of these newly certificated airports, air carriers also receive federal Essential Air Service (EAS) subsidies, so the Federal government will probably absorb most, if not all, of the cost of the rule through increased subsidies to air carriers. An analysis of the effect of this rule on air carrier service at newly certificated airports indicates that at airports where air carriers currently receive EAS subsidies, no significant change in service or average fare is expected to occur. At airports where EAS subsidies are not currently paid to air carriers (and these carriers would have to absorb the additional cost the final rule), average daily flights are expected to decline from 9 flights a day to 8 flights a day. Given the low enplanements per departure at

these airports, most of the passengers who would have used the eliminated flight could most likely be accommodated on the remaining flights.

**D. Risk Reduction Costs by Class I, II, and IV Airports**

Given the limited number of comments regarding the IRE estimates, the FAA takes the position that the IRE risk reduction cost estimates are reasonably accurate but did make two general adjustments to the IRE costs. First, the IRE risk reduction cost estimate for each class of airports is adjusted to account for a different number of airports in each class. Secondly, the FAA incorporates commenters' alternative risk reduction cost estimates. While these airport-specific estimates have been incorporated into the Final Regulatory Evaluation, the FAA believes that the IRE average cost remains reasonably accurate. As a result of these adjustments, the total risk reduction cost for the final rule for Class I, II and IV airports is increased by 18 percent above that of the IRE.

Table V - 1 fully accounts for the derivation of the final rule risk reduction costs.

**1. Risk Reduction Costs – Class I Airports**

In the IRE, the FAA identified 432 Class I airports. These airports ranged in size from the very largest airports, such as Hartsfield International in Atlanta, Georgia; O'Hare International in Chicago, Illinois; and Los Angeles International in Los Angeles, California, to much smaller airports such as Cortez Municipal in Cortez, Colorado; Hulman Regional in Terre Haute, Indiana; and Pierre Regional in Pierre, South Dakota.

The FAA used an average cost per requirement per airport to develop the estimated compliance cost of the proposed rule for Class I airports. Of the four classes of airports, the FAA expected that Class I airports would have the widest variation

around the average cost estimate. Variation in expected average compliance cost is natural given the large number of Class I airports, the many different sizes and facilities of these airports, the different geographic locations, and air carrier service provided.

From the estimated 432 Class I airports, FAA received five comments regarding the economic evaluation and only one of these comments provided alternative estimates. Given the limited number of comments, the FAA takes the position that the estimated compliance costs for Class I airports are reasonably accurate. However, risk reduction costs have increased for Class I airports because an additional four airports have been added to this classification, increasing total risk reduction costs by one percent. FAA also has accepted alternative cost estimates submitted by the one commenter that increased total initial risk reduction costs by two percent and increased the overall risk reduction cost for Class I airports by three percent for initial costs and one percent for recurring costs.

The adjustments for the change in the number of Class I airports and for the incorporation of the commenter's estimates result in an estimated final rule total cost for risk reduction costs for Class I Airports of \$232,070 for initial costs and \$1,008,110 for recurring costs. The derivation of revised risk reduction costs for Class I airports is contained in Table V-1.a. NPRM

The left-hand column in Table V-1 details the items that were used to adjust the IRE costs to obtain the cost estimates for the final rule. In Table V-1, the first row under the column heading, NPRM, includes the number of Class I airports (432 airports). The second row identifies the total risk-reduction initial cost estimate of \$225,677 and the total recurring cost estimate of \$996,192 for Class I airports reported in the IRE for the

proposed rule. Dividing the total costs by the number of Class I airports results in an average per airport cost of \$522 for initial costs and \$2,306 for annual recurring costs.

b. Adjustments:

i. Number of Airports

In making adjustments to risk reduction costs, the FAA started with the original number of Class I airports that did not submit comments (431 airports) and IRE cost estimates. Using these cost estimates, the FAA increased risk reduction cost slightly to account for the additional 4 airports. This was done by multiplying the final count of airports (436) by the average costs per airport of \$522 (initial cost) and \$2,306 (recurring cost). Accordingly, initial and recurring risk reduction costs increased by one percent (an additional \$2,090 and \$9,224, respectively). This adjustment increased the total risk reduction cost for Class I airports to \$227,592 for initial costs and \$1,005,416 for recurring costs.

ii. Comments Received

The NPRM cost adjusted for additional airports was then further refined to account for comments received. Only one Class I airport provided a comment with an alternative risk reduction cost estimate and this estimate was airport specific. Because the commenter provided operational and economic data to support the alternative cost estimate, the FAA used this cost estimate in place of the average cost estimate for this airport only. While this one change increases the total risk reduction costs for all Class I airports, the FAA believes the average cost estimates for the remaining 435 Class I airports remains reasonably accurate.

## 2. Risk Reduction Costs – Class II Airports

While the differences in Class II airports are not as broad as those for Class I airports, there still remains a wide size range of Class II airports. To accommodate such variances, the FAA used in the IRE an average cost per requirement per airport to develop risk reduction cost estimates.

The FAA received an alternative risk reduction cost estimate from only one of the 121 Class II airports. Similar to Class I airports, the FAA takes the position that the estimated risk reduction costs for Class II airports are relatively accurate. However, risk reduction costs have changed for Class II airports because the number of airports in this classification has decreased by eight airports, decreasing the total mitigation cost by seven percent. The FAA also used alternative cost estimates submitted by one commenter that increases the risk reduction costs for this airport and increases for Class II airports the initial risk reduction costs by five percent and recurring risk reduction costs by 16 percent.

The adjustments for the change in the number of Class II airports and for the incorporation of the commenter's estimates result in an estimated risk reduction cost for Class II Airports of \$325,768 for initial costs (a two percent increase) and \$198,909 for recurring costs (a nine percent increase). The derivation of revised risk reduction costs for Class II airports is contained in Table V-1.

### a. NPRM

The left-hand column in Table V-1 details the items that were used to adjust the IRE costs of the NPRM to obtain the cost estimates for the final rule. The first row under the column heading, NPRM, includes the IRE number of Class II airports (121

airports). The second row identifies total risk-reduction initial cost estimate of \$331,377 and total recurring cost estimate of \$184,053 for Class II airports, as reported in the IRE for the proposed rule. Dividing these total costs by the number of Class II airports results in an average per airport cost of \$2,739 for initial costs and \$1,521 for annual recurring costs.

b. Adjustments:

i. Number of Airports

In making adjustments to risk reduction costs, the FAA started with the original number of Class II airports (120 airports) and the IRE cost estimates. Using these cost estimates, the FAA decreased risk reduction costs to account for the loss of eight airports from this classification. This interim adjustment was done by multiplying the final count of Class II airports (113) by the average costs per airport of \$2,739 (initial cost) and \$1,521 (recurring cost). Accordingly, the initial and recurring risk reduction costs decreases by seven percent (a decrease of \$21,870 and \$12,169, respectively). This adjustment for the reduction in the number of Class II airports decreases the NPRM costs to \$309,507 for initial costs and \$171,873 for recurring costs.

ii. Comments Received

The NPRM cost adjusted for additional airports was then further refined to account for comments received. Only one Class II airport provided a comment with an alternative risk reduction cost estimate and this estimate was airport specific. For this airport, the estimate contained in the comments was substituted for the average cost estimate. Because the commenter provided operational and economic data to support alternative cost estimates, the FAA used this cost estimate for this airport only. While

this change increases the total risk reduction costs for all Class II airports, the FAA believes the IRE average cost estimates used for the remaining 112 Class II airports are reasonably accurate.

### 3. Risk Reduction Costs – Class IV Airports

In the IRE, the FAA used an average cost per requirement per airport to develop risk reduction cost estimates for proposed Class IV airports. The FAA takes the position that the IRE estimates are reasonably accurate. Only one comment was received from a Class IV airport operator and this airport operator supported the proposal. Even so, risk reduction costs have increased for Class IV airports because the number of airports in this classification has increased by three airports. Both the initial and recurring risk reduction costs increased by the addition of three airports multiplied by the associated average cost. This change increases the total risk reduction costs for Class IV airports by 20 percent.

The adjustments for the change in the number of Class IV airports results in an estimated final rule total cost for Class IV airports initial risk reduction cost increased from \$13,422 to \$16,110 and for annual recurring costs from \$5,595 to \$6,714. The derivation of revised risk reduction costs for Class IV airports is detailed in Table V-1.

#### a. NPRM

The left-hand column of Table V-1 details the items that were used to adjust the IRE costs of the NPRM to obtain the risk reduction cost estimates for the final rule. The first row under the column heading, NPRM, includes the IRE number of Class IV airports (15 airports). The second row identifies Class IV airports initial risk reduction cost estimate of \$13,422 and total recurring cost estimate of \$5,595, as reported in the

IRE. Dividing these total costs by the number of Class IV airports results in an average per airport cost of \$895 for initial costs and \$373 for recurring costs.

b. Adjustments

i. Number of Airports

In making adjustments to risk reduction costs, the FAA started with the original number of Class IV airports (14 airports) and the IRE cost estimates. Using this cost estimate, the FAA increased risk reduction costs to account for the additional three airports. This was done by multiplying the final count of 18 Class IV airports by the NPRM average costs per airport of \$895 (initial cost) and \$373 (recurring cost). Accordingly, the total initial and recurring risk reduction costs increased by 20 percent (an additional \$2,688 and \$1,119, respectively). This adjustment increased the total risk reduction cost for Class IV airports to \$16,110 for initial costs and \$6,714 for recurring costs.

ii. Comments

As noted above, only one economic comment was received from a Class IV airport operator and this airport operator supported the proposal. However, the commenter did not provide numerical data. Accordingly, no adjustments were made to NPRM costs based on comments received.

**E. Mitigation Costs Class I, II, and IV Airports**

The methodology to estimate the mitigation costs of the rule for Class I, II, and IV airports follows that discussed above for Risk Assessment Costs. As noted above, given the limited number of comments regarding the IRE estimates, the FAA believes the IRE mitigation cost estimates are reasonably accurate. The FAA made two general



adjustments to the IRE costs. First, the IRE mitigation cost estimates for each class of airports is adjusted to account for a different number of airports in each class.

Secondly, the FAA incorporated commenters' alternative mitigation cost estimates.

While these airport-specific estimates have been incorporated into the Final Regulatory Evaluation, the FAA believes that the IRE average cost is reasonably accurate and thus, changed the mitigation costs only for the airports that submitted alternative cost estimates. As a result of the adjustments to the IRE mitigation cost estimates, total mitigation costs for the final rule for Class I, II and IV airports are increased by 14 percent above that of the IRE.

Table V - 2 fully accounts for the derivation of the final rule mitigation costs. The table format is identical with Table V -1.

1. Mitigation Costs - Class I Airports

In the IRE, the FAA used an average cost per requirement per airport to develop mitigation costs estimates for proposed Class I airports. Of the four airport classes, the FAA expected that Class I airports mitigation cost would have the widest deviation around the average cost estimate. With only three comments providing alternative estimates from the estimated 432 airports, the FAA believes the IRE estimates are reasonably accurate. However, mitigation costs have increased for Class I airports because an additional four airports have been added to this classification, increasing total mitigation costs by one percent. FAA also has incorporated alternative cost estimates submitted by the three commenters that significantly increase the total cost for these airports and increases the overall mitigation costs for Class I airports by an additional 23 percent.

The adjustments for the change in the number of Class I airports and for the incorporation of the commenters' alternative estimates result in an estimated final rule total cost for mitigation costs for Class I airports of \$360,543 for initial costs and \$2,688,875 for recurring costs, a 24 percent increase. The derivation of revised mitigation costs for Class I airports is contained in Table V-2.

a. NPRM

The left-hand column in Table V-2 details the items that were used to adjust the IRE costs of the NPRM to obtain the mitigation cost estimates for the final rule. The first row under the column heading, NPRM, includes the IRE number of Class I airports (432 airports). The second row identifies the Class I airports initial mitigation cost estimate of \$290,040 and total recurring cost estimate of \$2,172,500, as reported in the IRE. Dividing these total costs by the number of Class I airports results in an average per airport cost of \$671 for initial costs and \$5,029 for recurring costs.

b. Adjustments

i. Number of Airports

In making adjustments to mitigation costs, the FAA started with the original Class I airports (429 airports) and the IRE cost estimates. Using these cost estimates, the FAA increased mitigation costs slightly to account for the additional 4 airports. This was done by multiplying the final count of 436 Class I airports by the average costs per airport of \$671 (initial cost) and \$5,029 (recurring cost). Accordingly, total initial and recurring mitigation costs increased by one percent (an additional \$2,516 and \$20,144, respectively). This adjustment for additional Class I airports increased the NPRM cost to \$292,556 for initial costs and \$2,192,644 for recurring costs.

## ii. Comments Received

The NPRM cost adjusted for additional airports was then further refined to account for comments received. Only three Class I airports provided a comment with an alternative risk reduction cost estimate and these estimates were airport specific. Because the commenters provided operational and economic data to support their cost data, the FAA has accepted these cost estimates in place of the average cost estimate for these airports only. The FAA believes cost estimates used for the remaining 433 Class I airports are reasonably accurate estimates even though the inclusion of the additional cost data from three commenters gives the appearance of significantly increasing total mitigation costs for all Class I airports.

A two-step procedure removes the average cost estimate for the three commenting airports and then adds the specific costs identified in the comments to the total. The average cost for these three Class I airports were first subtracted from the NPRM cost adjusted for additional Class I airports discussed above. Finally, the total alternative estimates for the three airports of \$70,000 for the initial costs and \$511,318 for recurring costs of the final rule are added.

## 2. Mitigation Costs - Class II Airports

The FAA identified 121 Class II airports in the IRE. While the differences in Class II airports are not as broad as those for Class I airports, there still remains a wide size range of the Class II airports. The FAA received two economic comments from the 121 Class II airports. Just as in the case of Class I airports, given the limited number of comments, the FAA believes the estimated compliance costs for Class II airports are relatively accurate. However, mitigation costs have changed for Class II airports

because the number of airports in this classification has decreased by eight airports, decreasing the total mitigation costs by seven percent. The FAA also used alternative cost estimates submitted by the two commenters that increase the recurring mitigation costs for these airports and subsequently increases the recurring mitigation costs for all Class II airports by 15 percent.

The adjustments for the change in the number of Class II airports and for the incorporation of the commenters' alternative estimates result in an estimated final rule total cost for mitigation costs for Class II airports of \$660,711 for initial costs (a seven percent increase) and \$1,553,541 for recurring costs (an eight percent increase). The derivation of mitigation costs for Class II airports is contained in Table V-2.

a. NPRM

The left-hand column in Table V-2 details the items that were used to adjust the IRE costs of the NPRM to obtain the mitigation cost estimates for the final rule. In the first row under the column heading, NPRM, includes the IRE number of Class II airports (121 airports). The second row identifies IRE mitigation initial cost estimate of \$707,520 and recurring cost estimate of \$1,448,512 for Class II airports. Dividing these costs by the number of Class II airports results in an average per airport cost of \$5,847 for initial costs and \$11,971 for recurring costs.

b. Adjustments

i. Number of Airports

In making adjustments to mitigation costs, the FAA used the original number of airports (119 airports) and the IRE cost estimates. Using these cost estimates, the FAA decreased mitigation costs to account for the loss of eight airports from this airport

classification. This interim adjustment multiplies the final count of Class II of (113 airports) airports by the average costs per airport of \$5,847 (initial cost) and \$11,971 (recurring cost). This change decreased the total initial and recurring mitigation costs by seven percent (a decrease of \$46,809 and \$95,789, respectively). This adjustment for the reduction in the number of Class II airports decreases the NPRM cost to \$660,711 for initial mitigation costs and \$1,352,723 for recurring mitigation costs.

ii. Comments Received

No Class II airports provided comments on the IRE initial mitigation costs. Therefore, the initial costs as adjusted for the number of airports of \$660,711 is the estimated Class II mitigation cost for the rule.

Two Class II airports provided comments on recurring mitigation costs. As these commenters provided operational and economic data to support their cost data, the FAA has used these cost estimates in place of the average cost estimate for these airports only. The FAA believes cost estimates used for the remaining 111 Class II airports are reasonably accurate estimates even though the inclusion of the additional cost data from the two commenters will give the appearance of increasing total mitigation costs for all Class II airports.

A two-step procedure removes the average cost estimate for these two commenting airports and then adds the specific comments to the total. The average cost for these two Class II airports were first subtracted from the NPRM cost adjusted for the reduced number of Class II airports as discussed above. Finally, the total of the two alternative estimates of \$224,760 for recurring costs of the final rule is added.

### 3 Mitigation Costs - Class IV Airports

In the IRE, the FAA used an average cost per requirement per airport to develop mitigation cost estimates for proposed Class IV airports. The FAA believes that the IRE estimates are reasonably accurate as only one comment was received from a Class IV airport operator and this airport operator supported the proposal. Even so, mitigation costs have increased for Class IV airports because the number of airports in this classification has increased by three airports. Both the initial and recurring mitigation costs increased by the addition of three airports multiplied by the associated average cost. This change increases the total mitigation costs for Class IV airports by 20 percent.

The adjustments for the change in the number of Class IV airports results in an estimated final rule total cost for Class IV airports initial mitigation cost increased from \$13,440 to \$16,128 and for annual recurring costs from \$8,064 to \$9,684. The derivation of revised mitigation costs for Class IV airports is contained in Table V-2.

#### a. NPRM

The left-hand column of Table V-2 details the items that were used to adjust the IRE costs of the NPRM to obtain the mitigation cost estimates for the final rule. In the first row under the column heading, NPRM, includes the IRE number of Class IV airports (15 airports). The second row identifies Class IV airports initial mitigation cost estimate of \$13,440 and total recurring cost estimate of \$8,064, as reported in the IRE. Dividing these total costs by the number of Class IV airports results in an average per airport cost of \$896 for initial costs and \$538 for recurring costs.

## b. Adjustments

### i. Number of Airports

In making adjustments to mitigation costs, the FAA used the original number of Class IV airports (14 airports) and the IRE cost estimates. Using these cost estimates, the FAA increased mitigation costs to account for the three additional airports. This was done by multiplying the final count of 18 Class IV airports by the average costs per airport of \$896 (initial cost) and \$538 (recurring cost). This change increases the total initial and recurring mitigation costs by 20 percent (an additional \$2,688 and \$1,620, respectively). This adjustment increased the NPRM cost adjusted for additional Class IV airports to \$16,128 for initial costs and \$9,684 for recurring costs.

### ii. Comments Received

As noted above, only one economic comment was received from a Class IV airport operator and this airport operator supported the proposal. However, this operator did not provide numerical data. Accordingly, no adjustments were made to NPRM costs based on comments received.

## **F. Class III Airport Costs**

The methodology to develop the expected costs to Class III airports resulting from the requirements of this rule is explained in the IRE. Only nine economic comments were received from Class III airports. Without comments to the contrary from the remaining Class III airports, the FAA believes that the IRE risk reduction cost estimates are reasonably accurate but did make two general adjustments to the IRE.

First, IRE cost estimates were adjusted to account for the change in the number of airports in this class. The total number of airports in the classification was reduced by

one airport. Secondly, the FAA incorporated the nine commenters' alternative risk reduction cost estimates. However, unlike the revised cost estimates for Class I, II and IV, the final rule compliance costs for Class III airports are presented on a per airport basis by combining average airport costs with commenters' alternative cost estimates. This cost per airport estimate was needed for a separate FAA study required by statute to be submitted to Congress on the expected economic impact of the rule on air service to Class III airports.

As noted earlier, the FAA has been conservative in its cost estimates for Class III airports and has generally used alternative cost estimates provided by the nine commenters, even though most of these commenters assumed that compliance with the final rule would require certain actions that the FAA does not believe would actually be required. In addition, these cost estimates do not take into account alternative means of compliance that are commonly allowed by the FAA to accommodate local conditions. Nor do these costs include assistance that may be provided to the airport through grant programs such as the Airport Improvement Program (AIP) or air carrier subsidy programs such as the Essential Air Service Program (EAS).

In Tables V - 3, V - 4, and V- 5, estimated incremental risk reduction and mitigation costs are listed for each Class III airport. These estimates assume each Class III airport would comply fully with part 139 requirements. The total expected cost per airport for each part 139 requirement identified in each table is listed in the far right column. Totals per part 139 requirement are listed in the bottom row of each table. A more detailed discussion of Class III airport expected compliance cost is discussed below.



## 1. Comments Received

Despite the relatively small number of proposed Class III airports, the FAA received the most comments regarding the IRE analysis regarding these airports. Of the estimated NPRM total of 38 Class III airports, nine Class III airports commented on economic aspects of the NPRM. Of these responses, five provided alternative cost estimates supported by economic and operational data that was used by the FAA. In addition, the States of Maine, Michigan, Montana, and Vermont commented in support of airports in their states. Vermont commented on a proposed Class II airport, however, this airport may eventually become a Class III airport.

The most common theme of these comments was that the airports and/or the air carriers utilizing the airport could not afford the costs of the proposed ARFF requirements. A related common theme was that the airports personnel were all fully employed with their existing duties and could not assume additional ARFF duties. Therefore, even though the rule allows cross utilization of employees, these comments indicate that it would not be possible for the airport to spare an existing employee for additional ARFF duties. Since the FAA had assumed that one airport person could assist in providing ARFF duties, the IRE estimated ARFF mitigation costs were substantially below the expected compliance costs as provided by these commenters. However, it also could be true that cross utilization of employees will not work at only these five Class III airports, rather than all Class III airports, which would mean that typical costs for Class III airports would be lower than the figures used.

## 2. Risk Reduction Costs

Table V-3 shows the estimated initial risk reduction costs and Table V-4 shows the recurring risk reduction cost estimates. For both tables, the column entries are broadly divided by Certification, Airport Certification Manual, and Operations Subparts. For each of these subparts, the section of part 139 that may require additional compliance cost is specified.

Generally, the cost estimates for the final rule are the IRE average cost estimate adjusted to be Class III airport specific. While the FAA expects that the alternative cost estimates provided will exceed the actual compliance cost, the FAA substituted the estimated costs for alternative cost estimates provided by airport operators. The one exception is the alternative cost estimate for snow and ice control provided by the operator of the Bar Harbor (ME) Airport. The IRE estimate for snow and ice control included only costs to document (and annually update) existing snow and ice control procedures. However, the alternative cost estimates provided by Bar Harbor included costs for labor and materials that the airport operator already incurs annually to control snow and ice. IRE estimate only includes additional cost that would be incurred the airport operator because of the final rule. Therefore, the FAA did not accept the airport operator's alternative estimate for snow and ice control.

The total cost of initial Class III airport risk reduction items is estimated to be \$921,368, an increase of \$218,820 over the IRE estimate. This increase reflects cost estimates provided by Class III airport commenters. The total annual recurring costs of the Class III airport risk reduction items is estimated to be \$233,482, a decrease of \$10,060 over the NPRM estimate.

### 3. Mitigation Costs

Most of the increased estimated compliance cost of the final rule is the result of an increase in mitigation costs for Class III airports. While there are modest adjustments to the estimated initial capital cost requirements and to ARFF maintenance and supply costs, the single largest adjustment to the IRE estimated cost is the increase in ARFF personnel expense.

At Class III airports, the final rule will require ARFF personnel and equipment appropriate for the type of aircraft served for scheduled air carrier operations conducted in 10 to 30 passenger seat aircraft. Class III airports are expected to be able to afford the capital purchase costs of the necessary truck and equipment, especially in light of the availability of state and federal funding to assist with these capital expenses. However, funds are generally not available for staffing and training necessary to comply with ARFF requirements.

One commenter included the cost of a fire station in its alternative cost estimate. The FAA did not include this estimate because a fire station is not a requirement of the final rule.

Most commenters disagreed with the assumption in the IRE regarding Class III airport ARFF personnel. The FAA had assumed that existing airport personnel could provide the equivalent of one ARFF staff person. Commenters responded that all staff are fully employed with their existing duties. The FAA used these comments and increased the number of additional ARFF personnel required by the rule from one to two for the purposes of estimating costs.

One additional ARFF staff person, per Class III airport, will increase annual compliance costs by nearly a million dollars. There were several exceptions to the general condition of two ARFF staff persons per Class III Airport. Three Class III Airports (Merill Miggs –Chicago (IL), Vernal (UT) and Imperial, (CA)) have been identified as having sufficient ARFF resources to meet the final rule requirements.

Five Class III airports provided estimates of ARFF personnel costs. These airports were Show Low Airport (SOW), Augusta State Airport (AUG), Bar Harbor Airport (BHB), Alamogordo Airport (ALM), and Silver City Airport (SVC). The FAA recognizes that these commenters estimates are likely to be high and expects that actual circumstances will result in costs that are lower than are estimated in this document.

SOW estimated that to provide two ARFF shifts per day with one person per crew, including training, would cost \$207,500 per year. The FAA used this estimate because it was based on a one-person crew. However, SOW's estimate of \$250,000 for an ARFF building was not accepted, as the final rule does not require an airport operator to store ARFF vehicles or equipment, or house ARFF personnel, in a building dedicated for that purpose. The final rule only requires the airport operator to have available during covered air carrier operations certain ARFF vehicles and equipment and that personnel performing ARFF duties be trained in a certain manner.

AUG provided estimates that were designed to provide 18 hours per day ARFF coverage and cover staff vacation time, sick time, etc. The airport estimated that this would require four, two person crews. The concept of two person firefighting crews is not unreasonable and may be required by some State and local laws. However, the final

rule does not specify the number of ARFF personnel required, only the type of equipment and fire extinguishing agent to be used. Therefore, the AUG estimate for ARFF personnel was adjusted by dividing the Airport's estimate of crewmembers salaries and benefits in half. FAA believes that this approximates the costs of four one-person crews.

BHB estimated that it would need to provide emergency services from 0500 to 2200 hours daily with provisions for late arrivals. The airport noted that this would require 4 full-time and 1 part-time ARFF/EMT persons and one ARFF captain. The airport estimated that the annual costs, including training for these personnel, would be \$239,450. In this case, because the airport appeared to be using one-person crews for an essentially a 24-hour operation, the airport operator's cost estimate was used without adjustment, based on the assumption that all Class III airports will only need one ARFF person per shift.

BHB also provided an alternative initial cost for ARFF vehicle and equipment of \$314,000. While accepting some of this alternative cost estimate as reasonable, the FAA believes the alternative cost estimate of \$214,500 provided for an Index A ARFF truck is too high. Accordingly, the IRE cost estimate for an Index A ARFF truck of \$50,000 has been used instead of BHB's truck estimate. The revised BHB's total initial cost of ARFF vehicle and equipment is \$149,500.

ALM provided a total cost estimate for recurring annual expenses of \$250,000. The estimate was not broken down and no information was provided about the hours of coverage to be provided. The FAA accepted this estimate because it is in line with the estimates provided by the other similar airports that provided comments.

SVC estimated that it would cost \$113,400 per year for ARFF personnel and training. This included the hiring of three people to provide ARFF coverage for seven days per week. Based on the assumption that all Class III airports will only need one ARFF person per shift, FAA accepted this estimate without adjustment because it seemed reasonable compared to FAA's basic estimate of two people per airport.

Even though FAA expects that Federal and local funds will significantly reduce the initial and capital mitigation expenses, FAA accepts that, in some cases, substantially higher alternative estimates provided by specific Class III airports. For most of the Class III airports, the IRE average mitigation cost estimates are the expected compliance cost for each airport. These estimates also assume that the airport operator could not obtain ARFF services from the local community for less money.

The estimated total initial mitigation cost for Class III airports is \$1,681,860 (see Table V-5). The estimated annual recurring mitigating costs are estimated to be \$4,153,005 (see Table V-5).

**G. Estimated Total Present Value Cost of the NPRM and Final Rules**

The FAA estimates that the ten-year, present value of the total compliance cost of this final rule is \$73,411,000. The changes to the IRE cost estimate were relatively minor for initial/capital costs for both the risk reduction and mitigation cost requirements of the rule. Nearly all of the increase in the estimated compliance costs can be attributed to the expense of needed ARFF personnel for Class III airports. The FAA had assumed that the existing Class III airport personnel would provide the equivalent of one ARFF staff person. After reviewing the comments, the FAA re-estimated Class III

compliance cost under the assumption that all existing personnel are fully occupied with existing duties.

Table V–6, Estimated Total Incremental Costs of the NPRM and Final Rules, documents, by airport class, the NPRM and Final Rule compliance costs by the two subcategories, Risk Reduction and Mitigation Costs. Just as in the IRE, the FAA recognizes that the average cost estimates methodology only approximates the compliance cost of the rule. FAA provided a 25 percent upper and lower bound for the IRE cost estimates. Even with the significant cost increase for the final rule cost estimate, applying the same range estimate to the final rule costs results in a lower bound estimate below the high estimate of the IRE. For the reasons discussed above in connection with individual comments, the FAA believes the lower bound is far more likely to represent actual costs of the final rule.

The Class III airports account for the highest cost per class even though the number of Class III airports is relatively low compared to the Class I and II airports. The approximate present value cost for Class I airports is \$26,560,000, for Class II airports the cost is \$13,290,000 and for Class IV airports the cost is \$150,000. For Class III airports, the approximate present value cost is \$33,411,000. The reason the estimated costs are much higher for Class III airports is that with this rule, for the first time, these airports are subject to all of part 139 regulations. (See Table V-7 for the Present Value Cost by Airport Class by One-Time and Recurring Costs). However, in all cases, the FAA believes actual local costs will be lower when tailored compliance and exemptions are considered.





<b>Table V- 2 part 139 Final Rule Regulatory Evaluation</b>						
<b>Derivation of Total Mitigation Costs of Final Rule Class I, II, &amp; IV Airports - August 16, 2002</b>						
<b>Adjustments To Table V-3 In NPRM RegEval for Comments &amp; Changes in the Number of Airports</b>						
	<b>Class I Airports -</b>		<b>Class II Airports -</b>		<b>Class IV Airports -</b>	
	Mitigation Costs		Mitigation Costs		Mitigation Costs	
	Initial	Recurring	Initial	Recurring	Initial	Recurring
<b>NPRM</b>						
No. of Airports	432	432	121	121	15	15
<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>\$290,040</b>	<b>\$2,172,500</b>	<b>\$707,520</b>	<b>\$1,448,512</b>	<b>\$13,440</b>	<b>\$8,064</b>
Average Cost Per Airport	\$671	\$5,029	\$5,847	\$11,971	\$896	\$538
<b>Adjustments</b>						
<b>1. For Changes in the No. of Airports</b>						
No. of Final Rule Airports	436	436	113	113	18	18
Average Cost / A/P	\$671	\$5,029	\$5,847	\$11,971	\$896	\$538
NPRM Cost Adjusted for New A/P's	\$292,556	\$2,192,644	\$660,711	\$1,352,723	\$16,128	\$9,684
<b>2. For Comments:</b>						
No. of Airports Commenting	3	3	0	2	0	0
Average Cost / Airport	\$671	\$5,029	\$5,847	\$11,971	\$896	\$538
To be Removed From NPRM Total Cost	\$2,013	\$15,087	\$0	\$23,942	\$0	\$0
3. Subtotal	\$290,543	\$2,177,557	\$660,711	\$1,328,781	\$16,128	\$9,684
4. Total Comments To Be Added	\$70,000	\$511,318	\$0	\$224,760	\$0	\$0
<b>5. Final Rule Total Cost</b>	<b>\$360,543</b>	<b>\$2,688,875</b>	<b>\$660,711</b>	<b>\$1,553,541</b>	<b>\$16,128</b>	<b>\$9,684</b>
						08/16/2002

**Table V-3 - Class III Airports - Estimated One-Time/Capital Incremental Risk Reduction Costs - Aug 16, 2002 (1)**

Column			A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R
					(C=A+B)				(G=D+E+F)										(Q=Sum H-P)	(R=C+G+Q)
Subpart:			B - Certification			C - Airport Certification Manual				D - Operations										
Section 139.			103	113	Subtotal - B	201	203	205	Subtotal - C	301	303	311	313	321	323	327	329	339	Subtotal - D	Grand Total
Associated City	State	ID	AOC App.	Deviations	Sub-Total - Certification	General Requirements	Content (3)	Amendment	Subtotal Airport Certification Manual	Records	Personnel	Merking, Signs, and Lighting	Snow & Ice Control (4)	Handling & Storage of Hazardous Substances & Materials	Traffic & Wind Direction Indicators	Self-Inspection Program	Pedestrian / Ground Vehicles (5)	Wildlife Hazard Management (6)	Subtotal - Operations	Grand Total - Risk Reduction
Lake Havasu City	AZ	HII	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$0	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$0	\$3,107	\$4,222
Show Low (S)(Y)(2)	AZ	SOW	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$0	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$350,000	\$353,107	\$354,222
El Dorado (S)	AR	ELD	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$538	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$0	\$3,645	\$4,760
Harrison (S)	AR	HRO	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$33,000	\$538	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$3,500	\$40,145	\$41,260
Jonesboro (S)	AR	JBR	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$33,000	\$538	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$0	\$36,645	\$37,760
Mountain Home (S)	AR	BFK	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$538	\$208	\$1,500	\$358	\$2,415	\$0	\$5,145	\$6,260
Imperial	CA	IFL	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$0	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$0	\$3,107	\$4,222
Inyokern	CA	IYK	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$0	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$0	\$3,107	\$4,222
Chicago (S)	IL	CGX	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$538	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$3,500	\$7,145	\$8,260
Spencer (S)	IA	SPW	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$538	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$3,500	\$7,145	\$8,260
Augusta (S)	ME	AUG	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$10,000	\$0	\$10,000	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$538	\$208	\$1,500	\$358	\$2,415	\$8,000	\$13,145	\$23,324
Bar Harbor (S)	ME	BHB	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$15,000	\$0	\$15,000	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$538	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$25,000	\$28,645	\$43,824
Rockland (S)	ME	RKD	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$538	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$3,500	\$7,145	\$8,260
Cumberland (S)	MD	CBE	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$538	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$3,500	\$7,145	\$8,260
Manistee (S)	MI	MBL	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$33,000	\$538	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$3,500	\$40,145	\$41,260
Glasgow (S)	MT	GGW	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$538	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$0	\$3,645	\$4,760
Glendive (S) (Y)	MT	GDV	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$0	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$0	\$3,107	\$4,222
Havre (S)	MT	HVR	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$538	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$0	\$3,645	\$4,760
Lewistown (S)	MT	LWT	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$538	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$0	\$3,645	\$4,760
Miles City (S)	MT	MLS	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$538	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$3,500	\$7,145	\$8,260
Sidney (S)	MT	SDY	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$538	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$0	\$3,645	\$4,760
Wolf Point (S) (Y)	MT	OLF	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$0	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$3,500	\$6,607	\$7,722
Chadron (S) (Y)	NE	CDR	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$0	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$0	\$3,107	\$4,222
Kearney (S)	NE	EAR	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$538	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$0	\$3,645	\$4,760
Alamogordo	NM	ALM	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$0	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$0	\$3,107	\$4,222
Carlsbad (S)	NM	CNM	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$538	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$0	\$3,645	\$4,760
Gallup (S)	NM	GUP	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$83,000	\$538	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$0	\$86,645	\$87,760
Santa Fe (S)	NM	SAF	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$538	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$3,500	\$7,145	\$8,260
Silver City (S)	NM	SVC	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$538	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$3,500	\$7,145	\$8,260
Dickinson (S)	ND	DIK	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$538	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$3,500	\$7,145	\$8,260
Ponca City (S)	OK	PNC	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$538	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$0	\$3,645	\$4,760
Brownwood (S)	TX	BWD	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$83,000	\$538	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$0	\$86,645	\$87,760
Moab (S)	UT	CNY	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$538	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$0	\$3,645	\$4,760
Vernal (S)	UT	VEL	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$538	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$0	\$3,645	\$4,760
Bluefield (S)	WV	BLF	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$33,000	\$538	\$208	\$1,500	\$358	\$2,415	\$3,500	\$41,645	\$42,760
Filipita Village	AS	FAQ	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$0	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$0	\$3,107	\$4,222
Ofu Village	AS	ZOF	\$179	\$0	\$179	\$0	\$936	\$0	\$936	\$14	\$112	\$0	\$0	\$208	\$0	\$358	\$2,415	\$0	\$3,107	\$4,222
Totals			\$6,623	\$0	\$6,623	\$0	\$57,760	\$0	\$57,760	\$618	\$4,144	\$298,000	\$14,526	\$7,696	\$4,500	\$13,246	\$89,355	\$425,000	\$856,985	\$921,368

**Notes:**

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 1. | Tables V-3 and V-4 are laid out identically for ease of reference. In some cases, there is no initial cost, but there is a recurring cost. In this case, this Table will show a column of zeros.  |
| 2. | An S following a City name indicates that the City is in a snow area. A Y following the S indicates that the airport already has a snow removal plan.   |
| 3. | The two commenting airports indicated that they would need to use a consultant and their costs reflect the use of a consultant. It is anticipated that the remaining airports would produce their own document with FAA assistance.   |
| 4. | A zero in this column indicates that a snow plan either exists or is not required. The FAA estimate is for the preparation of a snow plan. BHB Airport submitted an estimate that included equipment and a building. Because the snow plan is the basic rule requirement the cost of the snow plan was substituted for the BHB estimate of \$105,000.   |
| 5. | <b>Weighted Average</b>   |
| 6. | <b>Compliance with wildlife hazard management requirements is an event dependent cost. If a wildlife strike occurs, or wildlife is present in large numbers, an assessment of the hazard will be required. The result of this assessment may require the airport operator to develop and implement wildlife control measures. Fifteen Class III airports have published in the Airport/Facility Directory wildlife hazard warnings, of which three provide reasonable alternative costs to mitigate their wildlife hazards.</b> |



Table V-5 - Class III Airports - Estimated Incremental Mitigation Costs - Aug 16, 2002										
Column			A(1)	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
			Initial/Capital Costs			Recurring Annual Expenses				
			ARRF	AEP		ARRF			(AEP)	
Associated City (1)	State	ID	Truck/ Equipment	Airport Emergency Plan (AEP)	Total	Personnel (B)	Maintenance, Equipment And Supplies	Total	Airport Emergency Plan (AEP)	Total
Lake Havasu City	AZ	HII	\$50,000	\$896	\$50,896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
<b>Show Low</b>	<b>AZ</b>	<b>SOW</b>	<b>\$130,000</b>	\$896	\$130,896	<b>\$207,500</b>	\$7,000	<b>\$214,500</b>	\$538	<b>\$215,038</b>
El Dorado	AR	ELD	\$50,000	\$896	\$50,896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
Harrison	AR	HRO	\$50,000	\$896	\$50,896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
Jonesboro	AR	JBR	\$50,000	\$896	\$50,896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
Mountain Home	AR	BPK	\$50,000	\$896	\$50,896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
Imperial (3)	CA	IPL	\$0	\$896	\$896	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$538	\$538
Inyokern	CA	IYK	\$0	\$896	\$896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
Chicago (3)	IL	CGX	\$0	\$896	\$896	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$538	\$538
Spencer	IA	SPW	\$50,000	\$896	\$50,896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
<b>Augusta</b>	<b>ME</b>	<b>AUG</b>	<b>\$2,000</b>	<b>\$4,000</b>	<b>\$6,000</b>	<b>\$172,099</b>	<b>\$15,650</b>	<b>\$187,749</b>	\$538	<b>\$188,287</b>
<b>Bar Harbor</b>	<b>ME</b>	<b>BHB</b>	<b>\$149,500</b>	<b>\$15,000</b>	<b>\$164,500</b>	<b>\$239,450</b>	<b>\$18,000</b>	<b>\$257,450</b>	\$538	<b>\$257,988</b>
Rockland	ME	RKD	\$50,000	\$896	\$50,896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
Cumberland	MD	CBE	\$50,000	\$896	\$50,896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
Manistee	MI	MBL	\$50,000	\$896	\$50,896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
Glasgow	MT	GGW	\$50,000	\$896	\$50,896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
Glendive	MT	GDV	\$50,000	\$896	\$50,896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
Havre	MT	HVR	\$50,000	\$896	\$50,896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
Lewistown	MT	LWT	\$50,000	\$896	\$50,896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
Miles City	MT	MLS	\$50,000	\$896	\$50,896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
Sidney	MT	SDY	\$50,000	\$896	\$50,896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
Wolf Point	MT	OLF	\$50,000	\$896	\$50,896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
Chadron	NE	CDR	\$50,000	\$896	\$50,896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
Kearney	NE	EAR	\$0	\$896	\$896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
<b>Alamogordo (4)</b>	<b>NM</b>	<b>ALM</b>	\$50,000	\$896	<b>\$50,896</b>			<b>\$250,000</b>	\$538	<b>\$250,538</b>
Carlsbad	NM	CNM	\$0	\$896	\$896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
Gallup	NM	GUP	\$50,000	\$896	\$50,896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
Santa Fe	NM	SAF	\$50,000	\$896	\$50,896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
<b>Silver City</b>	<b>NM</b>	<b>SVC</b>	\$50,000	\$896	<b>\$50,896</b>	<b>\$113,400</b>	\$7,000	<b>\$120,400</b>	\$538	<b>\$120,938</b>
Dickinson	ND	DIK	\$50,000	\$896	\$50,896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
Ponca City	OK	PNC	\$0	\$896	\$896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
Brownwood	TX	BWD	\$50,000	\$896	\$50,896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
Moab	UT	CNY	\$50,000	\$896	\$50,896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
Vernal (3)	UT	VEL	\$0	\$896	\$896	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$538	\$538
Bluefield	WV	BLF	\$50,000	\$896	\$50,896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
Ft. Tula Village	AS	FAQ	\$50,000	\$896	\$50,896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
Otu Village	AS	Z08	\$50,000	\$896	\$50,896	\$100,000	\$7,000	\$107,000	\$538	\$107,538
<b>Totals</b>			<b>\$1,631,500</b>	<b>\$50,360</b>	<b>\$1,681,860</b>	<b>\$3,632,449</b>	<b>\$250,650</b>	<b>\$4,133,099</b>	<b>\$19,906</b>	<b>\$4,153,005</b>
<b>Notes:</b>										
1. Bolded rows indicate airports that commented on the IRE.										
2. Highlighted items in Column A indicate that that airport has the required ARFF equipment.										
3. The FAA determined that these airports already comply with ARFF requirements but need AEPs.										
4. Alamogordo's alternative recurring cost estimate of \$250,000 was a lump sum - no specific recurring costs for ARFF personnel, maintenance, equipment and supplies were provided.										
										08/16/2002

Table V-6 - Estimated Total Incremental Costs of NPRM and Final Rules-August 16, 2002									
Total Costs of NPRM Rule				Total Costs of Final Rule					
Airports									
						Initial/Capital Costs		Annual Recurring Costs	
Proposed Airport Class	Number of Airports	Initial/Capital Costs	Annual Recurring Costs	Number of Airports	Numerical Change From NPRM	Total	Numerical Change From NPRM	Total	
<b>1. Risk Reduction Items</b>									
Class I	432	\$ 225,677	\$ 996,192	436	\$6,393	\$ 232,070	\$ 11,918	\$ 1,008,110	
Class II	121	\$ 331,377	\$ 184,053	113	(\$5,609)	\$ 325,768	\$ 14,856	\$ 198,909	
Class III	38	\$ 702,548	\$ 243,542	37	\$218,820	\$ 921,368	\$ (10,060)	\$ 233,482	
Class IV	15	\$ 13,422	\$ 5,595	18	\$2,688	\$ 16,110	\$ 1,119	\$ 6,714	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>\$ 1,273,024</b>	<b>\$ 1,429,382</b>	<b>604</b>	<b>\$222,292</b>	<b>\$ 1,495,316</b>	<b>\$ 17,833</b>	<b>\$ 1,447,215</b>	
<b>2. Mitigation Items</b>									
Class I	432	\$ 290,040	\$ 2,172,500	436	\$70,503	\$ 360,543	\$ 516,375	\$ 2,688,875	
Class II	121	\$ 707,520	\$ 1,448,512	113	(\$46,809)	\$ 660,711	\$ 105,029	\$ 1,553,541	
Class III	38	\$ 1,236,928	\$ 971,842	37	\$444,932	\$ 1,681,860	\$ 3,181,163	\$ 4,153,005	
Class IV	15	\$ 13,440	\$ 8,064	18	\$2,688	\$ 16,128	\$ 1,620	\$ 9,684	
<b>Totals</b>	<b>606</b>	<b>\$ 2,247,928</b>	<b>\$ 4,600,918</b>	<b>604</b>	<b>\$471,314</b>	<b>\$ 2,719,242</b>	<b>\$ 3,804,187</b>	<b>\$ 8,405,105</b>	
<b>Program Total - Current Dollars</b>									
		<b>\$ 3,520,952</b>	<b>\$ 6,030,300</b>		<b>\$ 693,606</b>	<b>\$ 4,214,558</b>	<b>\$ 3,822,020</b>	<b>\$ 9,852,320</b>	
<b>3. Program Total - Present Value Costs (10 Years @ 7%)</b>									
		<b>NPRM</b>				<b>Final Rule</b>			
Initial/Capital Costs		\$ 3,520,952				\$ 4,214,558			
Recurring Costs (Over a ten year period)		\$ 42,351,102				\$ 69,196,784			
Program Total - Present Value Costs		\$ 45,872,054				\$ 73,411,342			
4. Estimated Present Value Cost Range					Numerical				
					Change				
Low		\$ 34,404,000			\$ 20,654,000	\$ 55,058,000			
Mid		\$ 45,872,000			\$ 27,539,000	\$ 73,411,000			
High		\$ 57,340,000			\$ 34,424,000	\$ 91,764,000			
<b>Notes:</b>									
									08/16/2002

Table V- 7							
Total Discounted Costs By Airport Class - August 16, 2002							
			Airport Class				
			I	II	III	IV	Total
One Time Costs			\$592,613	\$986,479	\$2,603,228	\$32,238	\$4,214,558
Discounted Recurring Costs			\$ 25,965,404	\$ 12,308,157	\$ 30,808,053	\$ 115,170	\$69,196,784
Total Costs			\$26,558,017	\$13,294,636	\$33,411,281	\$147,408	\$73,411,342
							08/16/2002

## **VI. BENEFIT-COST SUMMARY**

The estimated benefits and costs herein assume that each airport incurs the full compliance cost and that the traveling public and society receives the associated benefit. Much of the difficulty to accurately assess the expected benefit of this regulation is the complex nature of compliance with part 139 requirements. Each airport is unique with potentially different methods used by the airport operator to comply with part 139 requirements. Further, there are very significant Federal policies in place to mitigate the economic impact of the final rule. These policies are discussed in length in a separate report to Congress. This report discusses the economic impact of the final rule on air service to Class III airports.

As discussed in the economic report to Congress and in the cost estimate section above, several factors may help to mitigate part 139 compliance costs. First, Congress has directed the FAA to set aside \$15 million of AIP funds for certain capital expenditures that may be required by the final rule for four fiscal years. Second, the FAA will assist airport operators to obtain additional Federal funds, as appropriate. Third, at approximately two-thirds of these newly certificated airports (Class III airports), air carriers also receive federal EAS subsidies, so the Federal government will probably absorb most, if not all of the cost of the rule through increased subsidies to air carriers. Fourth, if Federal, state and local funding is not adequate, the FAA will seek alternative means of compliance with part 139 requirements or will use its statutory authority to grant exemptions from requirements that would be too costly, burdensome, or impractical.

Some of the requirements of the final rule that will impose costs (such as improved snow and ice control, marking, signing and lighting, and wildlife hazard management) are intended to prevent accidents. Others, such as emergency planning

and improved emergency response capability are intended to mitigate accidents should they occur. In both cases, the final rule is expected to save lives and reduce injuries and property damage. Without this rule, the FAA believes that some of the accidents and many near accidents that have occurred in the past are likely to be repeated in the future.

The FAA estimates that one or more accidents that will be mitigated by compliance with emergency response requirements of the final rule will result in an estimated benefit ranging from \$63 million to well in excess of \$100 million. The FAA is not providing a single dollar value for the total benefits of the final rule because the range of the possible compliance methods is too great and complying with risk reduction and accident mitigation requirements may require multiple actions. The FAA does note that the quantitative benefit estimate given is conservative and the potential error in assessing the benefits will be to underestimate total benefits.

FAA estimates that the present value of the 10-year cost of this final rule is about \$73.4 million. This estimate is likely to be high because it is based on assumed average costs across all airports in each airport class. In the application of this rule, each airport may already be in compliance with all or certain requirements of this final rule, or may receive relief from certain aspects of the rule through alternate means of compliance or the exemption process.

Thus, the FAA believes that numerous safety benefits will result from the multiple provisions in the final rule. These benefits will reduce the risk of future accidents and mitigate loss if another accident occurs. As noted above, the total cost estimate is conservative and does not include a host of policies and available funding designed to reduce the compliance cost of the final rule. Consequently, and in view of the moderate



costs and potential benefits, the FAA concludes that the benefits of the final rule justify the costs.

## **VII. FINAL REGULATORY FLEXIBILITY ANALYSIS (FRFA)**

The Regulatory Flexibility Act of 1980 (RFA) establishes “as a principle of regulatory issuance that agencies shall endeavor, consistent with the objective of the rule and of applicable statutes, to fit regulatory and informational requirements to the scale of the business, organizations, and governmental jurisdictions subject to regulation.” To achieve that principle, the RFA requires agencies to solicit and consider flexible regulatory proposals, and to consider the rationale for their actions. The RFA covers a wide range of small entities, including small businesses, not-for-profit organizations and small governmental jurisdictions.

Agencies must perform a review to determine whether a proposed or final rule will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities (SEIOSNSE). If the determination is that it will have such an impact, the agency must prepare a regulatory flexibility analysis as described in the RFA. However, if an agency determines that a proposed, or final, rule is not expected to have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities, section 605(b) of the RFA provides that the head of the agency may so certify and a regulatory flexibility analysis is not required. The certification must include a statement providing the factual basis for this determination, and the reasoning should be clear.

This final rule will affect publicly owned airports. When the population of a public airport-owning entity is less than 50,000, it is considered a small entity. Based upon the above review, FAA concludes that the final rule will have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Accordingly, the following final regulatory flexibility assessment was prepared, as required by the RFA.

### **Issues To Be Addressed In A Final Regulatory Flexibility Analysis**

The central focus of a final regulatory flexibility analysis (FRFA), like the initial regulatory flexibility analysis (IRFA), is the requirement that agencies evaluate the impact of a rule on

small entities and analyze regulatory alternatives that minimize the impact when there will be a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

The requirements, outlined in section 604(a)(1- 5), are listed and discussed below:

**1) A succinct statement of the need for, and objectives of, the rule;**

Prior to 1996, the FAA's statutory authority to certificate airports was limited to those airports serving air carrier operations using aircraft with more than 30 passenger seats. However, this authority was broadened by the Federal Aviation Administration Reauthorization Act of 1996. Title 49 USC 44706 was amended to allow the FAA to certificate airports, with the exception of those located in the State of Alaska, that serve any scheduled passenger operation of an air carrier operating aircraft designed for more than 9 passenger seats but less than 31 passenger seats. FAA's existing authority to certificate airports serving air carrier operations conducted in aircraft with more than 30 seats remained unchanged.

The final rule revises the airport certification regulation and extends airport certification requirements to airports serving air carriers with scheduled passenger operations in aircraft designed for at least nine seats but no more than 30 seats. To enhance safety in air transportation, this rule is necessary to ensure the consistent application of safety measures at all certificated airports, thereby reducing the risk of accidents and in the event of an accident, reducing fatalities, injuries, and property damage.

**2) A summary of the significant issues raised by the public comments in response to the IRFA, a summary of the assessment of the agency of such issues, and a statement of any changes made in the proposed rule as a result of such comments;**

There were a substantial number of comments from small airports concerned about the financial burden that the proposed rule would place on them, particularly the personnel costs associated with ARFF requirements.

In response to public comments, FAA made the following changes to the proposed rule in developing the final rule:

One of the changes is that the sections of the proposed rule that dealt with obtaining an exemption from the ARFF requirements have been clarified for the final rule. The final rule is more explicit in describing how to apply for an exemption. FAA believes that allowing alternate means of compliance to accommodate local conditions and the exemption process will result in actual compliance costs that are substantially less than those estimated in the final regulatory evaluation because both these processes will vary from airport to airport. FAA was not able to quantify the resulting reduction in compliance cost.

The time period to accomplish some requirements, such as the preparation of the ACM, was extended, especially for the smaller airports.

**3) A description of, and an estimate of the number of, small entities to which the rule will apply or an explanation of why no such estimate is available;**

The Small Business Administration (SBA) classifies all airports that are operated under the airport ownership of a public entity with 50,000 or less population as small entities.

Using the SBA's definition of a "small" public entity, there are approximately 200 small entity airports that will be affected by this rule. Most of the small entities are expected to be Class 1 airports (approximately 100 Class I airports), with the largest economic impact expected to occur to the Class III airports (approximately 25 Class III airports).

**4) A description of the projected reporting, record-keeping, and other compliance requirements of the rule, including an estimate of the classes of small entities which will be subject to the requirement and the type of professional skills necessary for preparation of the report or record; and**

The final rule will create additional reporting or recordkeeping beyond those already specified in existing part 139. For each airport, the preparation of this documentation may

involve the airport manager, operation and maintenance personnel, and clerical staff. The FAA estimates the average initial hours to set up a record-keeping system per small entity will be approximately 70 hours, and expects a continuing additional paperwork requirement of about 90 hours annually.

**5) A description of the steps the agency has taken to minimize the significant economic impact on small entities consistent with the stated objectives of applicable statutes, including a statement of the factual, policy, and legal reasons for selecting the alternative adopted in the final rule and why each one of the other significant alternatives to the rule considered by the agency which affect the impact on small entities was rejected.**

The FAA extensively considered several alternatives, described in the Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA), and determined that the alternative chosen for the NPRM was the only alternative that was relatively affordable and also achieved the safety objectives of the proposed rule. This initial alternative was subjected to public scrutiny during the comment period of the NPRM process. The comments received were responded to, as described above, and this initial alternative, as modified into the final rule is the selected alternative.

#### **Extended Discussion Of The Rule, Comments On Affordability And Safety**

The last major revision of part 139 occurred in November 1987, and since then, industry practices and technology have changed significantly. Subsequently the FAA has monitored the effectiveness of part 139 and has taken this opportunity to update part 139 requirements.

The FAA initiated this rulemaking to improve safety at airports serving small air carrier operations, fully appreciating the financial limitations of these airports. In 1996, Congress authorized the FAA to certificate airports serving scheduled air carrier operations conducted in 10 to 30 seat aircraft to further ensure safety in air transportation. This was the same year that all occupants died in a collision of a United Express Beech 1900C (under 30 seat air carrier

aircraft) and a Beech King Air aircraft (a general aviation aircraft). The National Transportation Safety Board concluded, “if on-airport ARFF protection had been required for this operation at Quincy Airport, lives might have been saved.”

An industry/FAA evaluation of possible regulatory alternatives for the certification of airports serving small air carrier aircraft concluded that there exists a need to require at least some minimum level of both risk reduction and accident mitigation measures at airports during operations of smaller air carrier airplanes. However, FAA recognizes the need to provide some flexibility in the implementation of certain safety measures at airports with infrequent air carrier service or where local resources are severely limited. Airports in smaller communities do not always have the resources to support their airports at the same level as large metropolitan areas without adversely affecting other community services and infrastructure.

Another final mitigating factor results from the FAA’s statutory authority to exempt certain airports from part 139 requirements. In some instances, the cost to comply with certain part 139 requirements could be too burdensome for some airport operators serving small air carrier operations. In such cases, the FAA will work with the airport operator in developing and tailoring an Airport Certification Manual to achieve safety through alternate compliance at that airport, and will assist the airport operator to obtain Federal funds, as appropriate. Also, FAA has the statutory authority to grant exemptions from part 139 requirements that would be too costly, burdensome, or impractical, including ARFF requirements.

There are several avenues available to small-entity airports to mitigate the economic impact of this rule. One is that the Airport Improvement Program (AIP) funding (often supplemented by state grants) is available for certain capital expenditures that may be required by the rule such as fire fighting equipment, airport marking and signs, and pavement rehabilitation. Recent legislation (AIR 21) set aside \$15 million of AIP funds for costs associated with the certification of airports serving small air carrier operations.

Another avenue is the Essential Air Service (EAS) program. For Class III airports that are owned by small communities, serve a limited number of passengers, and operate at a loss, it is likely that much of the remaining final actual costs to the airport would be passed through to the air carriers in the EAS program. At airports where carriers receive EAS subsidies (approximately two-thirds of all Class III airports), the Federal government will probably absorb most, if not all of the cost of the rule through increased subsidies.

### **Summary**

After considering the alternatives for the certification of airports serving small air carrier operations and alternatives for updating part 139 (as specified in the IFRA), the FAA determined that this rule amending part 139 is necessary to ensure safety in air transportation. However, to accommodate variations in airport size and operations, FAA will allow alternative means of compliance with part 139 requirements. This will allow the most cost effective and flexible method of ensuring safety to be employed at all covered airports while providing for the special needs of small entities.

## **VIII. INTERNATIONAL TRADE IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

The Trade Agreement Act of 1979 prohibits Federal agencies from engaging in any standards or related activities that create unnecessary obstacles to the foreign commerce of the United States. Legitimate domestic objectives, such as safety, are not considered unnecessary obstacles. The statute also requires consideration of international standards and where appropriate, that they be the basis for U.S. standards.

In accordance with the above statute, the FAA has assessed the potential effect of this final rule and determined that the rule's airport certification requirements will have little or no impact on trade for U.S. firms doing business in foreign countries and for foreign firms doing business in the United States.

## **IX. UNFUNDED MANDATES REFORM ACT**

The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (the Act), enacted as Pub. L. 104-4 on March 22, 1995, is intended, among other things, to curb the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on State, local, and tribal governments.

Title II of the Act requires each Federal agency to prepare a written statement assessing the effects of any Federal mandate in a proposed or final agency rule that may result in a \$100 million or more expenditure (adjusted annually for inflation) in any one year by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector; such a mandate is deemed to be a “significant regulatory action.”

This final rule does not contain such a mandate. Therefore, the requirements of Title II of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 do not apply.



# Appendices

Appendix III - 1 - Final Rule - Class I Airports, March 2001-Page 1											Page 1 of 10	
State	No.	Associated City	Airport Name	ID	Certification Status		CY - 99 Enplaned Passengers	<10,000 Enplaned Passengers	EAS	Airport Ownership	Population of Airport Owning Entity	Small Entity
					Current (A)	Proposed Class						
AL	1	Anniston	Anniston Metro	ANB	Full	I	216	Y		City of Anniston	25,774	Y
AL	2	Birmingham	Birmingham Int'l	BHM	Full	I	1,525,654			Birmingham Airport Authority	258,543	
AL	3	Dothan	Dothan	DHN	Full	I	66,025			Dothan-Houston Co. Airport Auth.	85,163	
AL	4	Huntsville	Huntsville Int'l	HSV	Full	I	514,221			Huntsville/Madison County	272,293	
AL	5	Mobile	Mobile Regional	MOB	Full	I	354,459			Mobile A/P Auth.	202,581	
AL	6	Montgomery	Montgomery Regional	MGM	Full	I	231,061			Montgomery A/P Authority	196,363	
AL	7	Muscle Shoals	Northwest Alabama Regional	MSL	Full	I	8,770	Y		Colbert & Lauderdale Counties	137,288	
AL	8	Tuscaloosa	Tuscaloosa Municipal	TCL	Full	I	1,491	Y		City of Tuscaloosa	82,379	
AK	1	Anchorage	Anchorage Int'l	ANC	Full	I	2,536,319			State of AK	609,311	
AK	2	Barrow	Wiley Post-Will Rogers Memorial	BRW	Full	I	40,751			State of AK	609,311	
AK	3	Bethel	Bethel	BET	Full	I	125,885			State of AK	609,311	
AK	4	Cold Bay	Cold Bay	CDB	Full	I	9,909	Y		State of AK	609,311	
AK	5	Cordova	Merle K. (Mudhole) Smith	CDV	Full	I	20,648			State of AK	609,311	
AK	6	Deadhorse	Deadhorse	SCC	Full	I	12,479			State of AK	609,311	
AK	7	Dillingham	Dillingham	DLG	Full	I	45,173			State of AK	609,311	
AK	8	Fairbanks	Fairbanks Int'l	FAI	Full	I	393,381			State of AK	609,311	
AK	9	Gustavus	Gustavus	GST	Full	I	11,570			State of AK	609,311	
AK	10	Homer	Homer	HOM	Full	I	32,859			State of AK	609,311	
AK	11	Iliamna	Iliamna	ILI	Full	I	13,806			State of AK	609,311	
AK	12	Juneau	Juneau	JNU	Full	I	377,559			City of Juneau	29,756	Y
AK	13	Kenai	Kenai Municipal	ENA	Full	I	106,530			City of Kenai	<10,000	Y
AK	14	Ketchikan	Ketchikan Int'l	KTN	Full	I	132,451			State of AK	609,311	
AK	15	King Salmon	King Salmon	AKN	Full	I	48,743			State of AK	609,311	
AK	16	Kodiak	Kodiak	ADQ	Full	I	80,107			State of AK	609,311	
AK	17	Kotzebue	Ralph Wien Memorial	OTZ	Full	I	59,351			State of AK	609,311	
AK	18	Nome	Nome	OME	Full	I	56,911			State of AK	609,311	
AK	19	Petersburg	Petersburg James Johnson	PSG	Full	I	21,047			State of AK	609,311	
AK	20	Port Heiden	Port Heiden	PTH	Full	I	1,694	Y		State of AK	609,311	
AK	21	St Paul Island	St Paul Island	SNP	Full	I	4,712	Y		State of AK	609,311	
AK	22	Sand Point	Sand Point	SDP	Full	I	4,366	Y		State of AK	609,311	
AK	23	Sitka	Sitka Rocky Gutierrez	SIT	Full	I	68,659			State of AK	609,311	
AK	24	Unalaska	Unalaska	DUT	Full	I	31,988			State of AK	609,311	
AK	25	Valdez	Valdez	VDZ	Full	I	21,536			State of AK	609,311	
AK	26	Wrangell	Wrangell	WRG	Full	I	13,895			State of AK	609,311	
AK	27	Yakutat	Yakutat	YAK	Full	I	14,702			State of AK	609,311	
AZ	1	Bullhead City	Laughlin-Bullhead Int'l	IFP	Full	I	39,931			Mohave County	128,884	
AZ	2	Flagstaff	Flagstaff Pulliam	FLG	Full	I	33,978			City of Flagstaff	118,011	
AZ	3	Grand Canyon	Grand Canyon National Park	GCN	Full	I	582,388			State of AZ	4,554,966	
AZ	4	Phoenix	Phoenix Sky Harbor Int'l	PHX	Full	I	16,781,835			City of Phoenix	1,159,014	
AZ	5	Tucson	Tucson Int'l	TUS	Full	I	1,781,091			Tucson A/P Auth.	449,002	
AR	1	Fayetteville	Drake Field	FVY	Full	I	20,213			City of Fayetteville	52,360	
AR	2	Fort Smith	Fort Smith Regional	FSM	Full	I	102,583			Fort Smith A/P Comm	75,776	
AR	3	Little Rock	Adams Field	LIT	Full	I	1,292,507			City of Little Rock	175,752	
AR	4	Texarkana	Texarkana Regional - Webb Field	TXK	Full	I	46,049			Texarkana Airport Authority	22,918	Y
Page 1 Totals:												
- No. of Airports:						44						
- No. of Airports with < 10,000 Enplanements:						7						
- No. of Airports that are Small Entities:						4						
Notes:												
(A): Full = Airport Operating Certificate (AOC)												

Appendix III - 1 - Final Rule - Class I Airports, March 2001-Page 2											Page 2 of 10	
State	No.	Associated City	Airport Name	ID	Certification Status		CY - 99 Enplaned Passengers	<10,000 Enplaned Passengers	EAS	Airport Ownership	Population of Airport Owning Entity	Small Entity
					Current (A)	Proposed Class						
CA	1	Arcata - Eureka	Arcata	ACV	Full	I	111,071			Humboldt County	123,389	
CA	2	Bakersfield	Meadows Field	BFL	Full	I	147,142			Kern County	628,605	
CA	3	Burbank	Burbank/Glendale/Pasadena	BUR	Full	I	2,376,645			Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena A/P	415,016	
CA	4	Carlsbad	McClellan-Palomar	CRQ	Full	I	78,364			San Diego County	2,722,650	
CA	5	Chico	Chico Municipal	CIC	Full	I	30,004			City of Chico	45,965	Y
CA	6	Concord	Buchanan Field	CCR	Full	I	236	Y		Contra Costa County	899,258	
CA	7	Fresno	Fresno Yosemite Int'l	FAT	Full	I	520,303			City of Fresno	396,011	
CA	8	Long Beach	Long Beach/Daugherty Field	LGB	Full	I	455,927			City of Long Beach	421,904	
CA	9	Los Angeles	Los Angeles Int'l	LAX	Full	I	30,830,915			City of Los Angeles	3,553,638	
CA	10	Modesto	Modesto/Harry Sham	MOD	Full	I	28,314			City of Modesto	178,559	
CA	11	Monterey	Monterey Peninsula	MRY	Full	I	258,605			Monterey Penin A/P District	27,722	Y
CA	12	Oakland	Metro Oakland Int'l	OAK	Full	I	4,850,517			Port of Oakland	367,230	
CA	13	Ontario	Ontario Int'l	ONT	Full	I	3,125,592			City of Los Angeles	3,553,638	
CA	14	Oxnard	Oxnard	OXR	Full	I	50,722			Ventura County	725,968	
CA	15	Palm Springs	Palm Springs Regional	PSP	Full	I	645,926			City of Palm Springs	43,347	Y
CA	16	Redding	Redding Municipal	RDD	Full	I	74,606			City of Redding	76,616	
CA	17	Sacramento	Sacramento Int'l	SMF	Full	I	3,783,566			County of Sacramento	1,125,976	
CA	18	San Bernardino	San Bernardino Int'l	SBD	Full	I	1,363	Y		USAF	183,474	
CA	19	San Diego	San Diego Int'l - Lindbergh Field	SAN	Full	I	7,636,623			San Diego Unified Port District	1,171,121	
CA	20	San Francisco	San Francisco Int'l	SFO	Full	I	19,249,988			City & County of SF	732,307	
CA	21	San Jose	San Jose Int'l	SJC	Full	I	5,582,359			City of San Jose	838,744	
CA	22	San Luis Obispo	San Luis Obispo Cty	SBP	Full	I	147,028			San Luis Obispo Cty	233,291	
CA	23	Santa Ana	John Wayne - Orange County	SNA	Full	I	3,739,968			Orange County	2,674,091	
CA	24	Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara Municipal	SBA	Full	I	407,737			City of Santa Barbara	86,154	
CA	25	Santa Maria	Santa Maria Public	SMX	Full	I	44,591			Santa Maria Public Aiport District	67,012	
CA	26	Santa Rosa	Sonoma County	STS	Full	I	30,066			Sonoma County	428,609	
CA	27	South Lake Tahoe	Lake Tahoe	TVL	Full	I	12,843			South Lake Tahoe	23,301	Y
CA	28	Stockton	Stockton Metro	SCK	Full	I	187	Y		San Joaquin County	542,504	
CO	1	Alamosa	San Luis Valley Regional/Bergm	ALS	Full	I	4,298	Y		City & County of Alamosa	14,374	Y
CO	2	Aspen	Aspen-Pitkin Co/Sardy	ASE	Full	I	215,685			Pitkin County	13,577	Y
CO	3	Colorado Springs	Colorado Springs Muni.	COS	Full	I	1,223,324			City of Colorado Springs	345,127	
CO	4	Cortez	Cortez Municipal	CEZ	Full	I	8,220	Y		City of Cortez	<10000	Y
CO	5	Denver	Denver Int'l	DEN	Full	I	18,039,836			City & Cty of Denver	498,985	
CO	6	Durango	Durango - LaPlata County	DRO	Full	I	96,647			City/La Plata County	40,145	Y
CO	7	Eagle	Eagle City Regional	EGE	Full	I	175,457			Eagle County	31,950	Y
CO	8	Fort Collins/Loveland	Fort Collins/Loveland Municipal	FNL	Full	I	855	Y		Fort Collins & Loveland	149,119	
CO	9	Grand Junction	Walker Field	GJT	Full	I	137,793			Walker Field Public Airport Authority	34,540	Y
CO	10	Gunnison	Gunnison County	GUC	Full	I	57,953			County of Gunnison	12,198	Y
CO	11	Steamboat Springs - Hayden	Yampa Valley	HDN	Full	I	108,797			Routt County	17,230	Y
CO	12	Montrose	Montrose Regional	MTJ	Full	I	70,799			Montrose County	30,278	Y
CO	13	Pueblo	Pueblo Municipal	PUB	Full	I	5,656	Y		City of Pueblo	99,406	
CO	14	Rifle	Garfield County Regional	RIL	Full	I	138	Y		Garfield County	37,267	Y
CO	15	Steamboat Springs	Steamboat Springs/Adams Field	???	Full	I	-	Y		City of Steamboat Springs	<10,000	Y
CO	16	Telluride	Telluride Regional	TEX	Full	I	22,483			Telluride Regional Airport Authority	<10,000	Y
CT	1	Bridgeport	Sikorsky Memorial	BDR	Full	I	5,523	Y		City of Bridgeport	137,990	
CT	2	Groton - New London	Groton - New London	GON	Full	I	12,292			State of CT	3,269,858	
CT	3	New Haven	Tweed-New Haven	HVN	Full	I	44,883			City of New Haven	124,665	
CT	4	Windsor Locks	Bradley Int'l	BDL	Full	I	3,148,196			State of CT	3,269,858	
DE	1	Wilmington	New Castle County	ILG	Full	I	44,551			Delaware River and Bay Auth.	474,838	
Page 2 Totals:												
- No. of Airports:							49					
- No. of Airports with < 10,000 Enplanements:							11					
- No. of Airports that are Small Entities:							16					

Appendix III - 6 Final Rule Class I Airports, March 2001, Page 3											Page 3 of 10	
State	No.	Associated City	Airport Name	ID	Certification Status		CY - 99	<10,000	ES	Airport Ownership	Population of Airport Owning Entity	Small Entity
					Current (A)	Proposed Class	Enplaned Passengers	Enplaned Passengers				
FL	1	Daytona Beach	Daytona Beach Int'l	DAB	Full	I	275,231			Volusia County	429,797	
FL	2	Fort Lauderdale	Fort Lauderdale/Hollywood	FLL	Full	I	6,932,142			Broward County	1,470,758	
FL	3	Fort Myers	Southwest Florida Int'l	RSW	Full	I	2,418,587			Lee County Port Auth	387,091	
FL	4	Gainesville	Gainesville Regional	GNV	Full	I	152,087			City/Alachua Cty Auth	198,326	
FL	5	Jacksonville	Jacksonville Int'l	JAX	Full	I	2,445,231			Jacksonville Port Auth	679,792	
FL	6	Key West	Key West Int'l	EYW	Full	I	275,909			Monroe County	81,919	
FL	7	Marathon	Marathon	MTH	Full	I	20,169			Monroe County	81,919	
FL	8	Melbourne	Melbourne Int'l	MLB	Full	I	273,813			City of Melbourne	67,631	
FL	9	Miami	Miami Int'l	MIA	Full	I	16,531,295			Dade County	2,044,600	
FL	10	Naples	Naples Municipal	APF	Full	I	54,494			City Airport Authority	19,777	Y
FL	11	Orlando	Orlando Int'l	MCO	Full	I	14,026,868			Orlando Av. Auth.	173,902	
FL	12	Orlando	Orlando - Sanford	SFB	Full	I	426,570			Sanford A/P Auth.	35,559	Y
FL	13	Panama City	Panama City-Bay Co Int'l	PFN	Full	I	164,426			City/Bay County A/P District	146,223	
FL	14	Pensacola	Pensacola Regional	PNS	Full	I	544,979			City of Pensacola	59,162	
FL	15	St. Petersburg - Clearwater	St. Petersburg/Clearwater Int'l	PIE	Full	I	381,730			Pinellas Cty	871,766	
FL	16	Sarasota - Bradenton	Sarasota/Bradenton Int'l	SRQ	Full	I	763,215			Sarasota/Manatee Airport Authority	538,803	
FL	17	Tallahassee	Tallahassee Regional	TLH	Full	I	454,624			City of Tallahassee	138,612	
FL	18	Tampa	Tampa Int'l	TPA	Full	I	7,490,117			Hillsborough Cty Aviation Authority	909,444	
FL	19	Vero Beach	Vero Beach Municipal	VRB	Full	I	105	Y		City of Vero Beach	16,458	Y
FL	20	West Palm Beach	Palm Beach Int'l	PBI	Full	I	2,877,039			Palm Beach County	1,018,524	
GA	1	Albany	Southwest Georgia Reg.	ABY	Full	I	44,339			City/Dougherty County	95,800	
GA	2	Athens	Athens/Ben Epps	AHN	Full	I	11,234			Clarke County	91,042	
GA	3	Atlanta	Hartsfield Atlanta Int'l	ATL	Full	I	38,136,866			City of Atlanta	401,907	
GA	4	Augusta	Bush Field	AOS	Full	I	215,556			City of Augusta	41,783	Y
GA	5	Brunswick	Glynco Jetport	BQK	Full	I	24,492			Glynn County	66,650	
GA	6	Columbus	Columbus Metro	CSG	Full	I	93,512			Columbus A/P Comm.	182,828	
GA	7	Macon	Middle Georgia Regional	MCN	Full	I	30,207			City of Macon	113,352	
GA	8	Savannah	Savannah Int'l	SAV	Full	I	763,905			Savannah A/P Comm.	136,262	
GA	9	Valdosta	Valdosta Regional	VLD	Full	I	32,695			City/Lowndes County A/P Auth.	83,980	
HI	1	Hilo	Hilo Int'l	ITO	Full	I	735,668			State of HI	1,186,602	
HI	2	Honolulu	Honolulu Int'l	HNL	Full	I	10,974,390			State of HI	1,186,602	
HI	3	Kahului	Kahului	OGG	Full	I	2,886,173			State of HI	1,186,602	
HI	4	Kailua/ Kona	Kona Int'l at Keahole	KOA	Full	I	1,271,744			State of HI	1,186,602	
HI	5	Kaunakakai	Molokai	MKK	Full	I	133,877			State of HI	1,186,602	
HI	6	Lahaina	Kapalua	JHM	Full	I	66,531			State of HI	1,186,602	
HI	7	Lanai City	Lanai	LNY	Full	I	82,639			State of HI	1,186,602	
HI	8	Lihue	Lihue	LIH	Full	I	1,345,733			State of HI	1,186,602	
ID	1	Boise	Boise Air Terminal	BOI	Full	I	1,420,073			City of Boise	152,737	
ID	2	Hailey (Sun Valley)	Friedman Memorial	SUN	Full	I	67,632			City of Hailey	<10,000	Y
ID	3	Idaho Falls	Fanning Field	IDA	Full	I	120,699			City of Idaho Falls	48,079	Y
ID	4	Lewiston	Lewiston-Nez Perce Co.	LWS	Full	I	67,041			City/Nez Perce County	36,819	Y
ID	5	Pocatello	Pocatello Regional	PIH	Full	I	46,679			City of Pocatello	51,344	
ID	6	Twin Falls	Magic Valley Regional	TWF	Full	I	36,425			City & County of Twin Falls	61,298	
Page 3 Totals:												
- No. of Airports:					43							
- No. of Airports with < 10,000 Enplanements:					1							
- No. of Airports that are Small Entities:					7							

Appendix III - 6 Final Rule Class I Airports, March 2001, Page 4											Page 4 of 10	
State	No.	Associated City	Airport Name	ID	Certification Status		CY - 99 Enplaned Passengers	<10,000 Enplaned Passengers	EAS	Airport Ownership	Population of Airport Owning Entity	Small Entity
					Current (A)	Proposed Class						
IL	1	Alton - St. Louis Regional	St. Louis Regional	ALN	Full	I	6	Y		St. Louis Regional	31,562	Y
IL	2	Belleville	Scott AFB/Midamerica	BLV	Full	I	1,818	Y		St. Clair County/USAF	233,866	
IL	3	Bloomington/Normal	Central Illinois Regional	BMI	Full	I	217,596			Bloomington/Normal Airport Authority	100,020	
IL	4	Champaign/Urbana	University of Illinois	CMI	Full	I	133,845			University of Illinois	11,895,849	
IL	5	Chicago	Midway	MDW	Full	I	6,218,667			City of Chicago	2,721,547	
IL	6	Chicago	O'Hare Int'l	ORD	Full	I	34,050,083			City of Chicago	2,721,547	
IL	7	Decatur	Decatur	DEC	Full	I	24,989			Decatur Park District	81,368	
IL	8	Mattoon/Charleston	Coles County Memorial	MTO	Full	I	903			Coles County A/P Authority	51,312	
IL	9	Moline - Quad Cities	Quad City Int'l	MLI	Full	I	378,616			Metropolitan A/P Auth.	102,650	
IL	10	Peoria	Greater Peoria Regional	PIA	Full	I	219,791			Greater Peoria A/P Auth.	112,306	
IL	11	Quincy	Quincy	UIN	Full	I	11,415			City of Quincy	39,681	
IL	12	Rockford	Greater Rockford	RFD	Full	I	32,608			Greater Rockford A/P Auth.	148,531	
IL	13	Springfield	Capital	SPI	Full	I	80,755			Springfield A/P Auth.	112,921	
IN	1	Evansville	Evansville Regional	EVV	Full	I	257,966			City/Vanderburgh County	166,837	
IN	2	Fort Wayne	Fort Wayne Int'l	FWA	Full	I	346,784			Ft. Wayne/Allen Cty AA	312,091	
IN	3	Indianapolis	Indianapolis Int'l	IND	Full	I	3,736,811			Indianapolis A/P Auth.	746,737	
IN	4	Lafayette	Purdue University	LAF	Full	I	19,228			Purdue University	44,344	Y
IN	5	Muncie	Delaware County	MIE	Full	I	232	Y		Delaware County A/P Auth.	117,625	
IN	6	South Bend	Michiana Reg Trans Ctr	SBN	Full	I	485,602			St. Joseph County A/P Auth.	258,056	
IN	7	Terre Haute	Hulman Regional	HUF	Full	I	3,949	Y		Hulman Reg. Arpt. Auth	54,585	
IA	1	Burlington	Burlington Regional	BRL	Full	I	18,828			SE Iowa Reg A/P Auth	26,853	Y
IA	2	Cedar Rapids	Eastern Iowa Airport	CID	Full	I	464,277			Eastern IA A/P Comm.	113,472	
IA	3	Des Moines	Des Moines Int'l	DSM	Full	I	849,603			City of Des Moines	193,422	
IA	4	Dubuque	Dubuque Regional	DBQ	Full	I	55,555			City of Dubuque	57,312	
IA	5	Ft. Dodge	Ft. Dodge Regional	FOD	Full	I	11,801			City of Fort Dodge	24,755	Y
IA	6	Mason City	Mason City Municipal	MCW	Full	I	13,477			City of Mason City	28,972	Y
IA	7	Sioux City	Sioux Gateway	SUX	Full	I	89,563			Airport Auth.	83,791	
IA	8	Waterloo	Waterloo Municipal	ALO	Full	I	58,904			Waterloo Municipal A/P Comm.	66,467	
KS	1	Dodge City	Dodge Regional	DDC	Full	I	5,818	Y		City of Dodge City	22,430	Y
KS	2	Garden City	Garden City Regional	GCK	Full	I	10,943			City of Garden City	25,366	Y
KS	3	Salina	Salina Municipal	SLN	Full	I	15,978			Salina A/P Auth.	44,176	Y
KS	4	Topeka	Forbes Field	FOE	Full	I	11,157			Met. Topeka A/P Auth.	119,658	
KS	5	Wichita	Mid-Continent	ICT	Full	I	595,316			Wichita A/P Auth.	320,395	
KY	1	Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky	Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky International Airport	CVG	Full	I	10,863,290			Kenton County Airport Board	364,040	
KY	2	Lexington	Blue Grass	LEX	Full	I	523,457			Lexington/ Fayette County A/P Auth.	239,874	
KY	3	Louisville	Louisville Int'l	SDF	Full	I	1,908,829			Regional A/P Auth.	260,689	
KY	4	Owensboro	Owensboro - Daviess County	OWB	Full	I	10,229			City/Daviess County	91,011	
KY	5	Paducah	Barkley Regional	PAH	Full	I	26,300			City of Paducah	26,601	Y
LA	1	Alexandria	Alexandria Int'l	AEX	Full	I	116,006			England Auth./Esler Indus. Devel.Dist.	46,051	Y
LA	2	Alexandria	Alexandria Esler Reg.	ESF	Full	I	-	Y		Esler Industrial Development District	46,051	Y
LA	3	Baton Rouge	Baton Rouge Metro-Ryan	BTR	Full	I	410,386			East Baton Rouge Parish	394,249	
LA	4	Lafayette	Lafayette Regional	LFT	Full	I	189,772			City/Parish of Lafayette	184,102	
LA	5	Lake Charles Regional	Lake Charles Regional	LCH	Full	I	76,263			Calcasieu Parish	178,874	
LA	6	Monroe	Monroe Regional	MLU	Full	I	122,412			City of Monroe	54,588	
LA	7	New Orleans	New Orleans Int'l	MSY	Full	I	4,735,571			City of New Orleans	476,625	
LA	8	Shreveport	Shreveport Regional	SHV	Full	I	375,785			City of Shreveport	191,558	
ME	1	Bangor	Bangor Int'l	BGR	Full	I	349,412			City of Bangor	31,649	Y
ME	2	Portland	Portland Int'l Jetport	PVWM	Full	I	678,852			City of Portland	63,123	
ME	3	Presque Isle	No. Maine Regional	POI	Full	I	28,626			City of Presque Isle	<10,000	Y
MD	1	Baltimore	Baltimore-Washington Int'l	BWI	Full	I	8,681,738			State of MD	5,094,289	
MD	2	Salisbury	Salisbury-Ocean City-Wicomico Regional	SBY	Full	I	73,124			Wicomico County	79,318	
Page 4 Totals:												
- No. of Airports:							51					
- No. of Airports with < 10,000 Enplanements:							6					
- No. of Airports that are Small Entities:							13					

State	No.	Associated City	Airport Name	ID	Certification Status		CY - 99 Enplaned Passengers	<10,000 Enplaned Passengers	EAS	Airport Ownership	Population of Airport Owning Entity	Small Entity
					Current (A)	Proposed Class						
MA	1	Boston	Logan Int'l	BOS	Full	I	13,183,145			Mass Port Auth.	558,394	
MA	2	Hyannis	Barnstable Municipal	HYA	Full	I	208,508			Town of Barnstable	43,699	Y
MA	3	Nantucket	Nantucket Memorial	ACK	Full	I	289,655			Town of Nantucket	7,508	Y
MA	4	Vineyard Haven	Martha's Vineyard	MVY	Full	I	73,461			Dukes County	13,578	Y
MA	5	Worcester	Worcester Regional	ORH	Full	I	24,758			City of Worcester	166,350	
MI	1	Benton Harbor	Southwest MI Reg	BEH	Full	I	5,513	Y		Benton Harbor/St Joseph Ct	61,234	
MI	2	Detroit	Detroit City	DET	Full	I	222,571			City of Detroit	1,000,272	
MI	3	Detroit	Detroit Wayne County	DTW	Full	I	16,982,496			Wayne County	2,127,087	
MI	4	Escanaba	Delta County	ESC	Full	I	20,550			Delta County	38,801	Y
MI	5	Flint	Bishop Int'l	FNT	Full	I	322,927			Bishop Int'l A/P Auth.	134,881	
MI	6	Grand Rapids	Kent County Int'l	GRR	Full	I	907,773			Kent County	539,425	
MI	7	Hancock	Houghton County Int'l	CMX	Full	I	27,998			Houghton County	35,810	Y
MI	8	Kalamazoo	Kalamazoo/Btl Crk Int'l	AZO	Full	I	278,212			Kalamazoo County	229,192	
MI	9	Lansing	Capital City	LAN	Full	I	370,081			Capital Region A/P Auth.	125,736	
MI	10	Marquette	Marquette County	SAW	Full	I	43,200			Marquette County	61,792	
MI	11	Muskegon	Muskegon County	MKG	Full	I	46,241			Muskegon County	165,882	
MI	12	Pellston	Pellston Regional Airport of Emmet	PLN	Full	I	31,977			Emmet County	28,339	Y
MI	13	Saginaw	MBS Int'l	MBS	Full	I	294,483			MBS Int'l	65,014	
MI	14	Traverse City	Cherry Capital	TVC	Full	I	189,809			Grand Traverse & Leelanau Counties	91,916	
MN	1	Bemidji	Bemidji-Beltrami County	B.JI	Full	I	29,457			City/Beltrami County	38,709	Y
MN	2	Brainerd	Brainerd-Crow Wing Regional	BRD	Full	I	19,190			City/Crow Wing County	51,105	
MN	3	Duluth - Superior	Duluth Int'l	DLH	Full	I	140,835			City of Duluth	83,699	
MN	4	Grand Rapids	Grand Rapids/Itasca Cty	GPZ	Full	I	10,367			City/Itasca County	43,555	Y
MN	5	Hibbing	Chisholm-Hibbing	HIB	Full	I	15,709			Chisholm-Hibbing Arprt.	17,600	Y
MN	6	International Falls	Falls Int'l	INL	Full	I	22,460			City of International Falls	<10,000	Y
MN	7	Minneapolis	Minneapolis-St. Paul Int'l	MSP	Full	I	15,683,399			Metro A/P Comm.	618,391	
MN	8	Rochester	Rochester Int'l	RST	Full	I	152,492			City of Rochester	75,638	
MN	9	Thief River Falls	Thief River Falls Reg	TVF	Full	I	8,854	Y		City of Thief River Falls	<10,000	Y
MS	1	Columbus/W Point	Golden Triangle Regional	GTR	Full	I	44,976			Golden Regional Auth.	22,724	Y
MS	2	Greenville	Mid Delta Regional	OLH	Full	I	13,265			City of Greenville	42,933	Y
MS	3	Gulfport - Biloxi	Gulfport - Biloxi Reg	GPT	Full	I	400,976			G-B Regional A/P Auth.	113,243	
MS	4	Hattiesburg - Laurel	Hattiesburg-Laurel Reg	PIB	Full	I	12,331			Regional Authority	66,389	
MS	5	Jackson	Jackson Int'l	JAN	Full	I	670,251			City of Jackson	192,923	
MS	6	Meridian	Key Field	MEI	Full	I	30,991			Meridian A/P Auth.	40,835	Y
MS	7	Tupelo	Tupelo Muni-CD Lemons	TUP	Full	I	15,494			A/P Auth.	35,194	Y
MO	1	Columbia	Columbia Reg	COU	Full	I	26,268			City of Columbia	76,756	
MO	2	Joplin	Joplin Regional	JLN	Full	I	28,877			City of Joplin	43,698	Y
MO	3	Kansas City	Kansas City Int'l	MCI	Full	I	5,760,037			City of Kansas City	441,259	
MO	4	Point Lookout	M Graham Clark	PLK	Full	I	71	Y		College of the Ozarks	<10,000	Y
MO	5	St. Louis	Lambert-St. Louis Int'l	STL	Full	I	15,075,992			City of St. Louis	351,565	
MO	6	Springfield	Springfield-Branson Regional	SGF	Full	I	349,320			City of Springfield	143,407	
MT	1	Billings	Billings Logan Int'l	BIL	Full	I	338,769			City of Billings	91,195	
MT	2	Bozeman	Gallatin Field	BZN	Full	I	223,006			Gallatin A/P Auth.	28,522	Y
MT	3	Butte	Bert Mooney	BTM	Full	I	47,963			Bert Mooney A/P Auth.	34,051	Y
MT	4	Great Falls	Great Falls Int'l	GTF	Full	I	138,705			GTF A/P Auth.	55,758	
MT	5	Helena	Helena Regional	HLN	Full	I	79,166			Helena Regional A/P Auth	27,982	Y
MT	6	Kalispell	Glacier Park Int'l	FCA	Full	I	146,942			Flathead Mun. A/P Auth	15,678	Y
MT	7	Missoula	Missoula Int'l	MSO	Full	I	221,292			Missoula Cty. A/P Auth.	88,818	
Page 5 Totals:												
- No. of Airports:						48						
- No. of Airports with < 10,000 Enplanements:						3						
- No. of Airports that are Small Entities:						21						

State	No.	Associated City	Airport Name	ID	Certification Status		CY - 99 Enplaned Passengers	<10,000 Enplaned Passengers	EAS	Airport Ownership	Population of Airport Owning Entity	Small Entity
					Current (A)	Proposed Class						
NE	1	Lincoln	Lincoln Municipal	LNK	Full	I	281,169			Lincoln A/P Auth.	209,192	
NE	2	Omaha	Eppley Airfield	OMA	Full	I	1,836,457			Omaha A/P Auth.	364,253	
NV	1	Elko	Elko Muni-JC Harris Fld	EKO	Full	I	119,295			City of Elko	19,372	Y
NV	2	Ely	Yelland Field	ELY	Full	I	1,763	Y				
NV	3	Las Vegas	McCarran Int'l	LAS	Full	I	16,055,319			Clark County	1,106,047	
NV	4	Reno	Reno/Tahoe Int'l	RNO	Full	I	2,912,801			A/P of Washoe Cty.	305,792	
NV	5	Winnemucca	Winnemucca Municipal	WMC	Full	I	94	Y		City/Cty of Winnemucca	<10,000	Y
NH	1	Lebanon	Lebanon Municipal	LEB	Full	I	20,152			City of Lebanon	12,571	Y
NH	2	Manchester	Manchester	MHT	Full	I	1,397,024			City of Manchester	100,967	
NH	3	Portsmouth	Pease Int'l Tradeport	PSM	Full	I	72			Pease Development Auth.	25,034	Y
NJ	1	Atlantic City	Atlantic City Int'l	ACY	Full	I	481,998			FAA	265,283,783	
NJ	2	Newark	Newark Int'l	EWK	Full	I	16,927,048			NY/NJ Port Auth.	19,938,492	
NJ	3	Teterboro	Teterboro	TEB	Full	I	10,433			NY/NJ Port Auth.	19,938,492	
NJ	4	Trenton	Trenton Mercer	TTN	Full	I	81,001			Mercer County	329,786	
NM	1	Albuquerque	Albuquerque Int'l	ABQ	Full	I	3,137,931			City of Albuquerque	429,681	
NM	2	Farmington	Four Corners Regional	FMN	Full	I	53,538			City of Farmington	37,936	Y
NM	3	Hobbs	Lea County/Hobbs	HOB	Full	I	2,512	Y		Lea County	58,387	
NM	4	Roswell	Roswell Industrial Air Center	ROW	Full	I	18,832			City of Roswell	47,559	Y
NY	1	Albany	Albany County	ALB	Full	I	1,140,518			Albany County	294,312	
NY	2	Binghamton	Binghamton Reg/E A Link	BGM	Full	I	136,305			Broome County	198,734	
NY	3	Buffalo	Buffalo Niagara Int'l	BUF	Full	I	1,827,466			Niagara Frontier Transp. Auth.	310,548	
NY	4	Elmira	Elmira/Coming Regional	ELM	Full	I	108,124			Chemung County	93,088	
NY	5	Islip	Long Island MacArthur	ISP	Full	I	942,379			Town of Islip	<10,000	Y
NY	6	Ithaca	Tompkins County	ITH	Full	I	101,945			Tompkins County	96,646	
NY	7	Jamestown	Chautauque Co/Jamestown	JHW	Full	I	20,827			Chautauque County	140,015	
NY	8	Monticello	Sullivan County Int'l	MSV	Full	I	31	Y		Sullivan County	70,355	
NY	9	Newburgh	Stewart Int'l (Private)	SWF	Full	I	307,685			State of NY	18,137,226	
NY	10	New York	JFK Int'l	JFK	Full	I	15,375,183			Port Auth. Of NY & NJ	19,938,492	
NY	11	New York	La Guardia	LGA	Full	I	11,968,030			City of New York	7,380,906	
NY	12	Niagara Falls	Niagara Falls Int'l	IAG	Full	I	2,253	Y		Niagara Frontier Transp. Auth.	310,548	
NY	13	Ogdensburg	Ogdensburg Int'l	OGS	Full	I	2,659	Y		Ogdensburg Bridge & Port A	12,993	Y
NY	14	Plattsburgh	Clinton County	PLB	Full	I	12,138			Clinton County	80,659	
NY	15	Poughkeepsie	Dutchess County	POU	Full	I	5,905	Y		Dutchess County	264,687	
NY	16	Rochester	Greater Rochester Int'l	ROC	Full	I	1,227,154			Monroe County	717,780	
NY	17	Saranac Lake	Adirondack Reg	SLK	Full	I	5,272	Y		Town of Harrietstown	<10,000	Y
NY	18	Syracuse	Syracuse Hancock Int'l	SYR	Full	I	1,088,456			City of Syracuse	155,865	
NY	19	Utica	Oneida County	UCA	Full	I	10,901			Oneida County	233,187	
NY	20	Watertown	Watertown Int'l	ART	Full	I	3,598	Y		City of Watertown	28,700	Y
NY	21	White Plains	Westchester County	HPN	Full	I	508,011			Westchester County	896,221	
NC	1	Asheville	Asheville Regional	AVL	Full	I	283,144			City of Asheville	64,067	
NC	2	Charlotte	Charlotte/Douglas Int'l	CLT	Full	I	10,618,589			City of Charlotte	441,297	
NC	3	Fayetteville	Fayetteville Regional /Grannis Field	FAY	Full	I	157,906			City of Fayetteville	79,361	
NC	4	Greensboro	Piedmont Triad Int'l	GSO	Full	I	1,382,198			GSO A/P Auth.	195,426	
NC	5	Greenville	Pitt-Greenville	PGV	Full	I	43,756			City/Pitt County	121,057	
NC	6	Hickory	Hickory Regional	HKY	Full	I	21,532			City of Hickory	30,523	Y
NC	7	Jacksonville	Albert J Ellis	OAJ	Full	I	54,722			Onslow County	143,013	
NC	8	Kinston	Kinston Regional Jetport	ISO	Full	I	13,057			City/Lenoir County	59,631	
NC	9	New Bern	Craven Cty Regional	EVN	Full	I	73,882			Craven County	87,367	
NC	10	Raleigh/Durham	Raleigh-Durham Int'l	RDU	Full	I	4,394,220			RDU A/P Auth.	393,634	
NC	11	Rocky Mount	Rocky Mount-Wilson	RWI	Full	I	7,678	Y		RWI A/P Auth.	92,566	
NC	12	Southern Pines	Moore County	SOP	Full	I	20,238			Moore County	70,174	
NC	13	Wilmington	New Hanover Int'l	ILM	Full	I	246,790			New Hanover County	147,642	
NC	14	Winston Salem	Smith Reynolds	INT	Full	I	7,242	Y		A/P Comm of Forsyth Cty	285,807	
<b>Page 6 Totals:</b>												
- No. of Airports:						53						
- No. of Airports with < 10,000 Enplanements:						11						
- No. of Airports that are Small Entities:						11						

Appendix III - 6 Final Rule Class I Airports, March 2001, Page 7											Page 7 of 10	
State	No.	Associated City	Airport Name	ID	Certification Status		CY - 99 Enplaned Passengers	<10,000 Enplaned Passengers	EAS	Airport Ownership	Population of Airport Owning Entity	Small Entity
					Current (A)	Proposed Class						
ND	1	Bismarck	Bismarck Municipal	BIS	Full	I	129,327			City of Bismarck	53,514	
ND	2	Fargo	Hector Int'l	FAR	Full	I	226,385			City of Fargo Muncpal AA	83,778	
ND	3	Grand Forks	Grand Forks Int'l	GFK	Full	I	88,281			Grand Forks Regional AA	50,675	
ND	4	Minot	Minot Int'l	MOT	Full	I	74,333			City of Minot	35,926	Y
OH	1	Akron - Canton	Akron-Canton Reg	CAK	Full	I	369,965			Akron Canton Regional A/P Auth.	297,961	
OH	2	Cleveland	Hopkins Int'l	CLE	Full	I	6,089,380			City of Cleveland	498,246	
OH	3	Cleveland	Cuyahoga County	CGF	Full	I	67	Y		Cuyohoga County	1,386,803	
OH	4	Cleveland	Burke Lakefront	BKL	Full	I	829	Y		City of Cleveland	498,246	
OH	5	Columbus	Ohio State University	OSU	Full	I	67	Y		Ohio State University	11,186,331	
OH	6	Columbus	Port Columbus Int'l	CMH	Full	I	3,366,430			Columbus A/P Auth.	657,053	
OH	7	Dayton	Cox Dayton Int'l	DAY	Full	I	1,115,756			City of Dayton	172,947	
OH	8	Toledo	Toledo Express	TOL	Full	I	248,017			Toledo-Lucas Co. A/P Auth.	451,325	
OH	9	Youngstown - Warren	Youngston-Warren Reg	YNG	Full	I	40,274			Western Reserve A/P Auth.	135,752	
OK	1	Lawton	Lawton-Ft Still Regional	LAW	Full	I	62,335			City of Lawton	82,582	
OK	2	Oklahoma City	Will Rogers World	OKC	Full	I	1,749,450			OK City Airport Trust	469,852	
OK	3	Tulsa	Tulsa Int'l	TUL	Full	I	1,711,539			City of Tulsa	378,491	
OR	1	Eugene	Mahlon Sweet Field	EUG	Full	I	359,388			City of Eugene	123,718	
OR	2	Klamath Falls	Klamath Falls Int'l	LMT	Full	I	33,729			City of Klamath Falls	18,580	Y
OR	3	Medford	Rogue Valley Int'l	MFR	Full	I	224,699			Jackson County	170,960	
OR	4	Pendleton	Eastern Oregon Reg.	PDT	Full	I	14,019			City of Pendleton	15,893	Y
OR	5	Portland	Portland Int'l	PDX	Full	I	6,749,174			The Port of Portland	480,824	
OR	6	Redmond	Roberts Field	RDM	Full	I	140,915			City of Redmond	10,618	Y
OR	7	Salem	McNary Field	SLE	Full	I	127	Y		City of Salem	122,566	
PA	1	Allentown	Lehigh Valley Int'l	ABE	Full	I	474,462			Lehigh-Northampton AA	102,211	
PA	2	Altoona	Altoona-Blair County	AOO	Full	I	16,969			Blair County A/P Auth.	130,923	
PA	3	Bradford	Bradford Regional	BFD	Full	I	13,131			Bradford A/P Auth.	10,577	Y
PA	4	Du Bois	Du Bois-Jefferson Co.	DWJ	Full	I	17,355			Clearfield and Jefferson Counties	127,223	
PA	5	Erie	Erie Int'l	ERI	Full	I	167,507			Erie Municipal A/P Auth.	105,270	
PA	6	Franklin	Venango Int'l	FKL	Full	I	7,077	Y		Venango County	58,067	
PA	7	Harrisburg	Harrisburg Int'l	MDT	Full	I	715,924			Susquehanna Reg. A/P Auth.	50,886	
PA	8	Johnstown	Johnstown-Cambria Co	JST	Full	I	20,899			Johnstown/Cambria Cty AA	157,419	
PA	9	Lancaster	Lancaster	LNS	Full	I	19,342			Lancaster A/P Auth.	53,597	
PA	10	Latrobe	Westmoreland Co	LBE	Full	I	27,929			Westmoreland County A/P Auth.	374,873	
PA	11	Philadelphia	Philadelphia Int'l	PHL	Full	I	11,762,140			City of Philadelphia	1,478,002	
PA	12	Pittsburgh	Allegheny County	AGC	Full	I	322	Y		Allegheny County	1,280,624	
PA	13	Pittsburgh	Pittsburgh Int'l	PIT	Full	I	9,302,650			Allegheny County	1,280,624	
PA	14	Reading	Reading Reg/C A Spatz Field	RDG	Full	I	52,519			Reading Reg. A/P Auth.	352,353	
PA	15	State College	University Park	UNV	Full	I	126,945			Penn State University	12,019,661	
PA	16	Wilkes-Barre	Wilkes-Barre/Scranton Int'l	AVP	Full	I	234,292			Luzerne and Lackawanna Counties	528,024	
PA	17	Williamsport	Williamsport Regional	IPT	Full	I	46,519			Williamsport Muni A/P Auth.	119,083	
RI	1	Providence	Green State	PVD	Full	I	2,556,183			State of RI	987,429	
Page 7 Totals:												
- No. of Airports:							41					
- No. of Airports with < 10,000 Enplanements:							6					
- No. of Airports that are Small Entities:							5					



Appendix III - 6 Final Rule Class I Airports, March 2001, Page 8											Page 8 of 10	
State	No.	Associated City	Airport Name	ID	Certification Status		CY - 99 Enplaned Passengers	<10,000 Enplaned Passengers	EAS	Airport Ownership	Population of Airport Owning Entity	Small Entity
					Current (A)	Proposed Class						
SC	1	Columbia	Columbia Metro	CAE	Full	I	563,577			City/Lexington County	200,371	
SC	2	Florence	Florence Regional	FLO	Full	I	57,123			City & County of Florence	124,379	
SC	3	Greer	Greenville - Spartanburg	GSP	Full	I	753,892			Greenville-Spartanburg A/P Commission	593,503	
SC	4	Hilton Head Island	Hilton Head	HXD	Full	I	100,194			Beaufort County	106,582	
SC	5	Myrtle Beach	Myrtle Beach International	MYR	Full	I	630,655			Horry County	144,053	
SD	1	Aberdeen	Aberdeen Regional	ABR	Full	I	25,365			City of Aberdeen	25,088	Y
SD	2	Pierre	Pierre Regional	PIR	Full	I	18,228			City of Pierre	13,422	Y
SD	3	Rapid City	Rapid City Regional	RAP	Full	I	195,209			City of Rapid City	57,642	
SD	4	Sioux Falls	Joe Foss Field	FSD	Full	I	357,227			Sioux Falls Regnl. A/P Auth.	113,223	
SD	5	Watertown	Watertown Municipal	ATY	Full	I	9,324	Y		City of Watertown	19,619	Y
TN	1	Bristol - Johnson City - Kingsport	Tri-Cities Regional TN/VA	TRI	Full	I	221,228			Three Cities	120,152	
TN	2	Chattanooga	Lovell Field	CHA	Full	I	303,689			Chattanooga Metro A/P Auth.	150,425	
TN	3	Jackson	McKellar-Sipes Reg.	MKL	Full	I	6,671	Y		City/Madison Cty	84,795	
TN	4	Knoxville	McGhee Tyson	TYS	Full	I	878,737			Metro Knoxville A/P Auth.	167,535	
TN	5	Memphis	Memphis Int'l	MEM	Full	I	5,211,305			Memphis/Shelby Cty A/P Auth.	596,725	
TN	6	Nashville	Nashville Int'l	BNA	Full	I	4,207,731			Metro Nashville A/P Auth.	511,263	
TX	1	Abilene	Abilene Regional	ABI	Full	I	47,984			City of Abilene	108,476	
TX	2	Amarillo	Amarillo Int'l	AMA	Full	I	437,506			City of Amarillo	169,588	
TX	3	Austin	Austin-Bergstrom Int'l	AUS	Full	I	3,305,073			City of Austin	541,278	
TX	4	Beaumont/Port Arthur	Jefferson County	BPT	Full	I	97,537			Jefferson County	241,940	
TX	5	Brownsville	Brownsville/South Padre Island	BRO	Full	I	71,949			City of Brownsville	132,091	
TX	6	College Station	Easterwood Field	BPT	Full	I	97,537			Texas A&M University	58,757	
TX	7	Corpus Christi	Corpus Christi	CRP	Full	I	449,672			City of Corpus Christi	280,260	
TX	8	Dallas-Fort Worth	Dallas/Ft. Worth Int'l	DFW	Full	I	27,990,212			Cities of Dallas & Ft. Worth	1,533,008	
TX	9	Dallas	Dallas Love Field	DAL	Full	I	3,415,478			City of Dallas	1,053,292	
TX	10	El Paso	El Paso Int'l	ELP	Full	I	1,688,927			City of El Paso	599,865	
TX	11	Fort Worth	Fort Worth Meacham Int'l	FTW	Full	I	1,389	Y		City of Fort Worth	479,716	
TX	12	Harlingen	Valley Int'l	HLR	Full	I	470,170			City of Harlingen	56,893	
TX	13	Houston	Ellington Field	EFD	Full	I	46,223			City of Houston	1,744,058	
TX	14	Houston	William Hobby	HOU	Full	I	4,243,907			City of Houston	1,744,058	
TX	15	Houston	Bush Intercontinental	IAH	Full	I	15,267,294			City of Houston	1,744,058	
TX	16	Killeen	Killeen Municipal	ILE	Full	I	90,418			City of Killeen	78,022	
TX	17	Laredo	Laredo Int'l	LRD	Full	I	87,739			City of Laredo	164,899	
TX	18	Longview	Gregg County	GGG	Full	I	30,497			Gregg County	113,147	
TX	19	Lubbock	Lubbock Int'l	LBB	Full	I	565,547			City of Lubbock	193,565	
TX	20	McAllen	McAllen Miller Int'l	MFE	Full	I	311,237			City of McAllen	103,352	
TX	21	Midland - Odessa	Midland Int'l	MAF	Full	I	485,623			City of Midland	97,162	
TX	22	San Angelo	Mathis Field	SJT	Full	I	39,411			City of San Angelo	88,098	Y
TX	23	San Antonio	San Antonio Int'l	SAT	Full	I	3,403,544			City of San Antonio	1,067,816	
TX	24	Temple	Draughon-Miller Central Texas	TPL	Full	I	136	Y		City of Temple	51,394	
TX	25	Tyler	Tyler Pounds Field	TYR	Full	I	74,233			City of Tyler	82,185	
TX	26	Waco	Waco Regional	ACT	Full	I	67,045			City of Waco	108,412	Y
UT	1	Salt Lake City	Salt Lake City Int'l	SLC	Full	I	9,453,726			Salt Lake City	172,575	
UT	2	Wendover	Wendover	ENV	Full	I				Tooele County	26,601	Y
VT	1	Burlington	Burlington Int'l	BTV	Full	I	434,111			City of Burlington	39,004	Y
Page 8 Totals:												
- No. of Airports:							45					
- No. of Airports with < 10,000 Enplanements:							4					
- No. of Airports that are Small Entities:							7					

State	No.	Associated City	Airport Name	ID	Certification Status		CY - 99 Enplaned Passengers	<10,000 Enplaned Passengers	EAS	Airport Ownership	Population of Airport Owning Entity	Small Entity
					Current (A)	Proposed Class						
VA	1	Charlottesville	Charlottesville-Albemarle	CHO	Full	I	171,150			Charlottesville-Albemarle AA	40,767	Y
VA	2	Danville	Danville Regional	DAN	Full	I	49	Y		City of Danville	53,472	
VA	3	Lynchburg	Lynchburg Regional / Glenn Field	LYH	Full	I	85,822			City of Lynchburg	67,250	
VA	4	Newport News - Williamsburg	Newport News - Williamsburg	PHF	Full	I	217,047			Peninsula A/P Comm.	189,044	
VA	5	Norfolk	Norfolk Int'l	ORF	Full	I	1,494,396			Norfolk A/P Auth.	233,430	
VA	6	Richmond	Richmond Int'l	RIC	Full	I	1,318,137			Capital Region A/P Comm.	198,267	
VA	7	Roanoke	Roanoke Regional	ROA	Full	I	346,365			Roanoke Regional A/P Comm	95,548	
VA	8	Staunton/Waynesboro	Shenandoah Valley Regional	SHD	Full	I	16,494			Shenandoah Valley Regional A/P Comm.	43,728	Y
VA	9	Washington, DC	Dulles International	IAD	Full	I	9,400,078			USA	273,230,855	
VA	10	Washington, DC	Reagan National	DCA	Full	I	7,166,772			USA	273,230,855	
WA	1	Bellingham	Bellingham Int'l	BLI	Full	I	97,406			Port of Bellingham	152,512	
WA	2	Bremerton	Bremerton National	PWT	Full	I	553	Y		Port of Bremerton	231,741	
WA	3	Everett	Snohomish County	PAE	Full	I	136	Y		Snohomish County	564,610	
WA	4	Moses Lake	Grant County	MWH	Full	I	11,861			Port of Moses Lake	13,984	Y
WA	5	Pasco	Tri-Cities	PSC	Full	I	206,105			Port of Pasco	103,836	
WA	6	Port Angeles	William B. Fairchild Int'l	CLM	Full	I	28,201			Port of Port Angeles	18,674	Y
WA	7	Pullman/Moscow	Pullman/Moscow Reg	PUW	Full	I	34,887			Pullman/Moscow Regional Airport Board	44,744	Y
WA	8	Seattle	Seattle-Tacoma Int'l	SEA	Full	I	13,610,469			Port of Seattle	524,704	
WA	9	Seattle	Boeing Field	BFI	Full	I	11,536			King County	1,632,852	
WA	10	Spokane	Spokane Int'l	GEG	Full	I	1,516,888			City & County of Spokane	404,650	
WA	11	Spokane	Fairchild AFB	SKA	Full	I	-	Y		USAF	265,283,783	
WA	12	Walla Walla	Walla Walla Regional	ALW	Full	I	31,166			Port of Walla Walla	53,501	
WA	13	Wenatchee	Pangborn Memorial	EAT	Full	I	52,855			Ports of Chelan & Douglas Ct	93,201	
WA	14	Yakima	Yakima Air Terminal	YKM	Full	I	89,569			City & County of Yakima	218,318	
WV	1	Beckley	Raleigh City Memorial	BKW	Full	I	3,212	Y		Raleigh County Airport Authority	76,819	
WV	2	Charleston	Yeager	CRW	Full	I	266,679			Central WV Reg A/P Auth.	56,098	
WV	3	Clarksburg	Benedum	CKB	Full	I	16,276			Benedum Arpt. Auth.	17,410	Y
WV	4	Huntington	Tri-State/Ferguson Field	HTS	Full	I	62,609			Tri-State A/P Auth.	53,941	
WV	5	Lewisburg - Greenbrier	Greenbrier Valley	LWB	Full	I	12,771			Greenbrier County A/P Auth.	35,502	Y
WV	6	Morgantown	Morgantown Municipal	MGW	Full	I	21,561			City of Morgantown	26,919	Y
WV	7	Parkersburg	Wood Co Arpt Gill Robb Wilson	PKB	Full	I	25,677			Wood County A/P Auth.	87,029	
WI	1	Appleton	Outagamie County	ATW	Full	I	266,629			Outagamie County	154,175	
WI	2	Eau Claire	Chippewa Valley Reg.	EAU	Full	I	20,611			Eau Claire County	89,237	
WI	3	Green Bay	Austin Straubel Int'l	GRB	Full	I	352,886			Brown County	214,244	
WI	4	La Crosse	La Crosse Muni	LSE	Full	I	113,640			City of La Crosse	50,212	
WI	5	Madison	Dane Cty Regional	MSN	Full	I	681,272			Dane County	397,511	
WI	6	Milwaukee	General Mitchell Int'l	MKE	Full	I	2,962,677			Milwaukee County	908,940	
WI	7	Mosinee	Central Wisconsin	CWA	Full	I	142,980			Marathon & Portage Counties	187,198	
WI	8	Oshkosh	Wirman Regional	OSH	Full	I	4,382	Y		Winnebago County	149,934	
WI	9	Rhineland	Rhineland-Oneida Co.	RHI	Full	I	38,651			Rhineland and Oneida County	35,697	Y
WY	1	Casper	Natrona Cty Int'l	CPR	Full	I	66,184			Natrona County	63,638	
WY	2	Cheyenne	Cheyenne	CYS	Full	I	20,520			Cheyenne Airport Board	79,175	
WY	3	Cody - Yellowstone	Yellowstone Regional	COD	Full	I	28,326			City of Cody	<10,000	Y
WY	4	Gillette	Gillette-Campbell Cty	GCC	Full	I	15,356			Campbell County	32,087	Y
WY	5	Jackson Hole	Jackson Hole	JAC	Full	I	165,595			Jackson Hole Airport Board	<10,000	Y
WY	6	Laramie	Laramie Regional	LAR	Full	I	11,589			City/Albany County	29,709	Y
WY	7	Riverton	Riverton Regional	RIW	Full	I	13,327			City of Riverton	10,050	Y
WY	8	Rock Springs	Rock Springs-Sweetwaer	RKS	Full	I	10,311			City of Rock Springs	19,742	Y
WY	9	Sheridan	Sheridan County	SHR	Full	I	15,052			Sheridan County	25,199	Y
WY	10	Worland	Worland Municipal	WRL	Full	I	2,747	Y		City of Worland	<10,000	Y
Page 9 Totals:												
- No. of Airports:							50					
- No. of Airports with < 10,000 Enplanements:							7					
- No. of Airports that are Small Entities:							17					

Appendix III - 1 Final Rule Class I Airports, March 2001, Page 10											Page 10 of 10																																																				
State	No.	Associated City	Airport Name	ID	Certification Status		CY - 99	<10,000	EAS	Airport Ownership	Population of Airport Owning Entity	Small Entity																																																			
					Current (A)	Proposed Class	Enplaned Passengers	Enplaned Passengers																																																							
Other US Airports																																																															
American Samoa																																																															
AO	1	Pago Pago	Pago Pago Int'l	PPG	Full	I	57,625			Govt. of American Samoa	56,911																																																				
Guam																																																															
GU	1	Agana	Guam International	GUM	Full	I	1,550,245			U.S. Navy	248,709,873																																																				
Midway																																																															
	1	Sand Island	Hendersen Field	MDY	Full	I	N.A.			N.A.	N.A.																																																				
North Mariana Islands																																																															
CM	1	Rota Island	Rota Island	GRO	Full	I	36,762			Commonwealth Ports Authority	56,157																																																				
CM	2	Saipan Island	Saipan Int'l	GSN	Full	I	576,989			Commonwealth Ports Authority	56,157																																																				
CM	3	Tinian Island	West Tinian	TNI	Full	I	39,173			Commonwealth Ports Authority	56,157																																																				
Puerto Rico																																																															
PR	1	Aguadilla	Rafael Hernandez	BQN	Full	I	6,052	Y		Puerto Rico Ports Authority	3,731,000																																																				
PR	2	Mayaguez	Eugenio Maria De Hostos	MAZ	Full	I	26,093			Puerto Rico Ports Authority	3,731,000																																																				
PR	3	Ponce	Mercedita	PSE	Full	I	9,234	Y		Puerto Rico Ports Authority	3,731,000																																																				
PR	4	San Juan	Luis Munoz Marin Int'l	SJU	Full	I	4,760,643			Puerto Rico Ports Authority	3,731,000																																																				
U.S. Virgin Islands																																																															
VI	1	Charlotte Amalie	Cyril E. King	STT	Full	I	529,705			VI Port Authority	113,897																																																				
VI	2	Christiansted	Henry E. Rohlsen	STX	Full	I	233,647			VI Port Authority	113,897																																																				
Page 10 Totals:																																																															
- No. of Airports:					12																																																										
- No. of Airports with < 10,000 Enplanements:					2																																																										
- No. of Airports that are Small Entities:					0																																																										
Class I Airport Totals:																																																															
<table><tr><td rowspan="2">Page</td><td colspan="3">Airports</td></tr><tr><td>Number</td><td>&lt;10,000 Enpax</td><td>Small Entity</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>44</td><td>7</td><td>4</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>49</td><td>11</td><td>16</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>43</td><td>1</td><td>7</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>51</td><td>6</td><td>13</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>48</td><td>3</td><td>21</td></tr><tr><td>6</td><td>53</td><td>11</td><td>11</td></tr><tr><td>7</td><td>41</td><td>6</td><td>5</td></tr><tr><td>8</td><td>45</td><td>4</td><td>7</td></tr><tr><td>9</td><td>50</td><td>7</td><td>17</td></tr><tr><td>10</td><td>12</td><td>2</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>Totals:</td><td>436</td><td>58</td><td>101</td></tr></table>													Page	Airports			Number	<10,000 Enpax	Small Entity	1	44	7	4	2	49	11	16	3	43	1	7	4	51	6	13	5	48	3	21	6	53	11	11	7	41	6	5	8	45	4	7	9	50	7	17	10	12	2	0	Totals:	436	58	101
Page	Airports																																																														
	Number	<10,000 Enpax	Small Entity																																																												
1	44	7	4																																																												
2	49	11	16																																																												
3	43	1	7																																																												
4	51	6	13																																																												
5	48	3	21																																																												
6	53	11	11																																																												
7	41	6	5																																																												
8	45	4	7																																																												
9	50	7	17																																																												
10	12	2	0																																																												
Totals:	436	58	101																																																												
Source: Data Provided by:																																																															
1. FAA																																																															
2. U.S. Census Bureau																																																															

Appendix III - 2 Final Rule Class II Airports, March 2001										Page 1 of 3		
State	No.	Associated City	Airport Name	ID	Certification Status		CY - 99 Enplaned Passengers	<10,000 Enplaned Passengers	EAS	Airport Ownership	Population - 1990	Small Entity
					Current (A)	Proposed Class						
AL	1	Mobile	Mobile Downtown	BFM	Limited	II	142	Y		Mobile A/P Auth.	378,643	
AL	2	Talladega	Talladega Municipal	ASN	Limited	II	41	Y		City of Talladega	26,179	Y
AZ	1	Kingman	Kingman	IGM	Limited	II	2,574	Y		City or Kingman	12,722	Y
AZ	2	Page	Page Municipal	PGA	Limited	II	23,979			City of Page	6,598	Y
AZ	3	Phoenix	Williams Gateway	IWA	Limited	II	-	Y		Williams Gateway Airport Authority	319,946	
AZ	4	Prescott	Ernest Love Field	PRC	Limited	II	5,543	Y		City of Prescott	26,455	Y
AR	1	Blytheville	Arkansas Int'l	BYH	Limited	II	26	Y		Gosnell Reg. Arpt. Auth.	22,906	Y
AR	2	Hot Springs	Memorial Field	HOT	Limited	II	2,411	Y		City	32,462	Y
CA	1	Crescent City	Jack McNamara Field	CEC	Limited	II	12,289			Del Norte County	23,460	Y
CA	2	Paso Robles	Paso Robles Munic.	PRB	Limited	II	260	Y		City of Paso Robles	18,583	Y
CA	3	Victorville	Southern CA Int'l	VCV	Limited	II	45,251			VVEDA	40,674	Y
CA	4	Visalia	Visalia Municipal	VIS	Limited	II	10,255			City of Visalia	75,636	
CO	1	Akron	Akron-Washington Cty	AKO	Limited	II	222	Y		Town of Akron	2,559	Y
CO	2	Lamar	Lamar Municipal	LAA	Limited	II	1,433	Y		City of Lamar	8,343	Y
CT	1	Danbury	Danbury Municipal	DXR	Limited	II	116	Y		City of Danbury	65,585	
CT	2	Hartford	Hartford - Brainard	HFD	Limited	II	2,475	Y		State of CT	3,287,116	
FL	1	Lakeland	Lakeland Linder Reg.	LAL	Limited	II	30	Y		City of Lakeland	70,576	
FL	2	Ocala	Ocala Regional	OCF	Limited	II	62	Y		City of Ocala	42,045	Y
FL	3	Punta Gorda	Charlotte County	PGD	Limited	II	51	Y		Charlotte County	110,975	
FL	4	St. Augustine	St. Augustine	SGJ	Limited	II	28	Y		St. Augustine AA	49,229	Y
FL	5	Titusville	Space Coast Regional	TIX	Limited	II	9	Y		Titusville Cocoa Beach A/P Auth	39,394	Y
FL	6	Titusville	NASA Shuttle Landing	X68	Limited	II	-	Y		NASA	265,283,783	
GA	1	Rome	Richard B. Russel	RMG	Limited	II	2	Y		Floyd County	81,251	
IL	1	Carbondale - Murphysboro	Southern Illinois	MDH	Limited	II	103	Y		Southern Ill. Apt. Auth.	42,568	Y
IL	2	Marion	Williamson Cty Reg.	MWA	Limited	II	10,108			Williamson County A/P Auth	57,733	
IL	3	Mount Vernon	Mount Vernon	MVN	Limited	II	306	Y		Mt. Vernon AA	16,988	Y
IL	4	Sterling - Rock Falls	Whiteside County	SQI	Limited	II	231	Y		Whiteside County	60,186	
IN	1	Anderson	Anderson Municipal	AID	Limited	II	10	Y		City of Anderson	59,459	
IN	2	Bloomington	Monroe County	BMG	Limited	II	1,408	Y		Monroe County	108,978	
IN	3	Columbus	Columbus Municipal	BAK	Limited	II	29	Y		City of Columbus	31,802	Y
IN	4	Elkhart	Elkhart Municipal	EKM	Limited	II	180	Y		City of Elkhart	43,627	Y
IN	5	Gary	Gary/Chicago	GYM	Limited	II	2,475	Y		Gary AA District	116,646	
IN	6	Indianapolis	Mt. Comfort	MQJ	Limited	II	51	Y		Indianapolis AA	731,278	
IN	7	Valparaiso	Porter Co. Municipal	VPZ	Limited	II	165	Y		Porter County Muni A/P Auth.	128,932	
IA	1	Clinton	Clinton Municipal	CWI	Limited	II	-	Y		City of Clinton	29,201	Y
IA	2	Ottumwa	Ottumwa Industrial	OTM	Limited	II	1,317	Y		City of Ottumwa	24,488	Y
KS	1	Goodland	Renner Field / Goodland Municipal	GLD	Limited	II	1,079	Y		City of Goodland	4,983	Y
KS	2	Great Bend	Great Bend Municipal	GBD	Limited	II	3,029	Y		City of Great Bend	1,976	Y
KS	3	Hays	Hays Municipal	HYS	Limited	II	7,143	Y		City of Hays	8,364	Y
KS	4	Hutchinson	Hutchinson Municipal	HUT	Limited	II	97	Y		City of Hutchinson	39,308	Y
KS	5	Liberal	Liberal Municipal	LBL	Limited	II	7,318	Y		City of Liberal	16,573	Y
KS	6	Manhattan	Manhattan Regional	MHK	Limited	II	19,908			City of Manhattan	9,191	Y
KS	7	Olathe	New Century Aircenter	IXD	Limited	II	68	Y		Johnson County	35,054	Y
KY	1	Bowling Green	Bowling Green/Warren County Regional	BWG	Limited	II	311	Y		City/Warren County	117,314	
LA	1	Lake Charles	Chennault Int'l	CWF	Limited	II	55	Y		Chennault Industrial Airpark	70,580	
LA	2	New Iberia	Acadiana Regional	ARA	Limited	II	277	Y		Iberia Parish	31,828	Y
LA	3	New Orleans	Lakefront	NEW	Limited	II	2,217	Y		Orleans Levee District	496,938	
Page 1 Totals:												
- No. Of Airports:						47						
- No. Of Airports with < 10,000 enplanements:						41						
- No. of Airports that are Small Entities:						28						
Notes:												
(A): Limited = Limited Airport Operating Certificate (LAOC)												
											03/27/2001	

Appendix III - 2 Final Rule Class II Airports, March 2001									Page 2 of 3			
State	No.	Associated City	Airport Name	ID	Certification Status		CY - 99	<10,000	EAS	Airport Ownership	Population - 1990	Small Entity
					Current (A)	Proposed Class	Enplaned Passengers	Enplaned Passengers				
MD	1	Hagerstown	Washington Co. Reg.	HGR	Limited	II	27,050			Washington County	121,393	
MA	1	Bedford	Laurence Hanscom Field	BED	Limited	II	14,743			Mass Port Auth.	574,283	
MA	2	Westfield	Barnes Municipal	BAF	Limited	II	21	Y		City of Westfield	38,372	Y
MI	1	Alpena	Alpena Co. Regional	APN	Limited	II	10,263			Alpena County	30,605	Y
MI	2	Battle Creek	W K Kellog	BTL	Limited	II	452	Y		City of Battle Creek	53,540	
MI	3	Bellaire	Antrim County	ACB	Limited	II	-	Y		Antrim County	18,185	Y
MI	4	Detroit	Willow Run	YIP	Limited	II	3,046	Y		Wayne County	2,111,687	
MI	5	Gaylord	Otsego County	GLR	Limited	II	3	Y		Otsego County	17,957	Y
MI	6	Iron Mountain / Kingsford	Ford	IMT	Limited	II	9,220	Y		Dickinson County	26,831	Y
MI	7	Ironwood	Gogebic-Iron Co.	IWD	Limited	II	1,943	Y		Gogebic County	18,052	Y
MI	8	Menominee- Marinette	Menominee-Marinette Twin Co.	MNM	Limited	II	66	Y		Both Counties	65,468	
MI	9	Pontiac	Oakland Co. Int'l	PTK	Limited	II	8,585	Y		Oakland County	1,083,592	
MI	10	Sault Ste. Marie	Chippewa Int'l	CIU	Limited	II	14,937			Chippewa County EDC	34,604	Y
MN	1	Fairmont	Fairmont Municipal	FRM	Limited	II	768	Y		City of Fairmont	277	Y
MN	2	Mankato	Mankato Municipal	MKT	Limited	II	12	Y		City of Mankato	41,632	Y
MN	3	St. Cloud	St. Cloud Regional	STC	Limited	II	25,439			City of St. Cloud	48,812	Y
MS	1	Bay St. Louis	Stennis Int'l	HSA	Limited	II	-	Y		Port & Harbour Commission	<10,000	Y
MS	2	Natchez	Hardy-Anders Field Natchez	HEZ	Limited	II	45	Y		City/Adams County	54,816	
MS	3	Oxford	University-Oxford	UOX	Limited	II	266	Y		University of Mississippi	2,575,475	
MS	4	Pascagoula	Trent Lott Int'l	PQL	Limited	II	3	Y		Jackson County	115,243	
MT	1	West Yellowstone	Yellowstone	WYS	Limited	II	4,998	Y		State of MT	799,065	
NE	1	Alliance	Alliance Municipal	AIA	Limited	II	1,497	Y		Alliance AA	9,765	Y
NE	2	Grand Island	Central NE Regional	GRI	Limited	II	13,063			Hall County AA	48,925	Y
NE	3	Hastings	Hastings Municipal	HSI	Limited	II	44	Y		Hastings AA	22,837	Y
NE	4	McCook	McCook Municipal	MCK	Limited	II	2,307	Y		City of McCook	8,112	Y
NE	5	Norfolk	Karl Stefan Municipal	OFK	Limited	II	1,903	Y		City of Norfolk	21,476	Y
NE	6	North Platte	North Platte Regional	LBF	Limited	II	8,094	Y		North Platte AA	22,605	Y
NE	7	Scottsbluff	William Heilig Field	BFF	Limited	II	12,219			Scottsbluff County	13,711	Y
NM	1	Las Cruces	Las Cruces Int'l	LRU	Limited	II	2,995	Y		City of Las Cruces	62,126	
NM	2	Ruidoso	Sierra Blanca Reg.	SRR	Limited	II	297	Y		Village of Ruidoso	7,323	Y
NY	1	Farmingdale	Republic	FRG	Limited	II	2,147	Y		State	17,990,778	
NY	2	Glens Falls	Warren County	GFL	Limited	II	21	Y		Warren County	59,209	
NY	3	Massena	Massena Int'l - Richards Field	MSS	Limited	II	4,110	Y		Town of Massena	13,826	Y
ND	1	Devils Lake	Devils Lake Municipal	DVL	Limited	II	3,194	Y		Devils Lake AA	7,782	Y
ND	2	Jamestown	Jamestown Municipal	JMS	Limited	II	3,003	Y		Jamestown AA	15,571	Y
ND	3	Williston	Sloulin Field Int'l	ISN	Limited	II	5,613	Y		City of Williston	13,131	Y
OH	1	Cincinnati	Cincinnati Municipal - Lunken Field	LUK	Limited	II	448	Y		City of Cincinnati	345,818	
OH	2	Columbus	Rickenbacker Int'l	LCK	Limited	II	663	Y		DOD/RPA	265,283,783	
OH	3	Lorain/Elyria	Lorain County Reg.	22G	Limited	II	-	Y		Lorain County Regional AA	271,126	
OH	4	Mansfield	Mansfield Lahm Munic. Springfield-Beckley Municipal	MFD	Limited	II	162	Y		City of Mansfield	50,627	
OH	5	Springfield	Springfield-Beckley Municipal	SGH	Limited	II	11	Y		City of Springfield	70,487	
OH	6	Wilmington	Airborne Airpark	ILN	Limited	II	-	Y		ABX Air, Inc.	11,199	Y
OK	1	Stillwater	Stillwater Municipal	SWO	Limited	II	1,382	Y		City	36,676	Y
Page 2 Totals:												
- No of Airports:					43							
- No of Airports with < 10,000 enplanements:					36							
- No. of Airports that are Small Entities:					25							
												04/02/2001

## Page 3 of 3

100

Appendix III-3 - Class III Airports, Proposed Final List, July 1, 2001											Page 1 of 1	
State	No.	Associated City	Airport Name	ID	Certification Status		CY - 1999	< 10,000	EAS	Airport Ownership	Population - 1990	Small Entity
					Current	Proposed Class	Enplaned Passengers	Enplaned Passengers				
AZ	1	Lake Havasu City	Lake Havasu City	HII	None	III	9,119	Y		City	24,363	Y
AZ	2	Show Low	Show Low Municipal	SOW	None	III	3,905	Y		City	5,019	Y
AR	1	El Dorado	South AR Regional	ELD	None	III	1,519	Y	Y	City	23,146	Y
AR	2	Harrison	Boone County	HRO	None	III	1,900	Y	Y	Boone County	28,297	Y
AR	3	Jonesboro	Jonesboro Municipal	JBR	None	III	2,345	Y	Y	City	46,535	
AR	4	Mountain Home	Baxter Co. Regional	BPK	None	III	4,340	Y		Baxter County	31,186	Y
CA	1	Imperial	Imperial County	IPL	None	III	24,834			Imperial County	109,303	
CA	2	Inyokern	Inyokern	IYK	None	III	9,089	Y		Indian Wells Apt. Dist.	2,647	Y
IL	1	Chicago	Merrill Meigs	CGX	None	III	10,175			City	2,783,726	
IA	1	Spencer	Spencer Municipal	SPW	None	III	6,258	Y	Y	City	11,066	Y
ME	1	Augusta	Augusta State	AUG	None	III	6,101	Y	Y	State	1,227,928	
ME	2	Bar Harbor	Hancock County-Bar Harbor	BHB	None	III	11,841		Y	Hancock County	46,948	Y
ME	3	Rockland	Knox County Regional	RKD	None	III	19,358		Y	Knox County	36,310	Y
MD	1	Cumberland	Greater Cumberland Reg.	CBE	None	III	6,142	Y		Potomac Highland AA	23,706	Y
MI	1	Manistee	Manistee Co. - Blacker	MBL	None	III	1,281	Y	Y	City/County	27,999	Y
MT	1	Glasgow	Wokal Fld/Glasgow Int'l	GGW	None	III	2,256	Y	Y	City/Valley County	5,192	Y
MT	2	Glendive	Dawson Community	GDV	None	III	1,510	Y	Y	County	9,505	Y
MT	3	Havre	Havre City-County	HVR	None	III	1,533	Y	Y	City/Hill County	30,899	Y
MT	4	Lewistown	Lewiston Municipal	LWT	None	III	1,202	Y	Y	City/Fergus County	18,134	Y
MT	5	Miles City	Frank Wiley Field	MLS	None	III	1,951	Y	Y	City	8,461	Y
MT	6	Sidney	Sidney-Richland Muni.	SDY	None	III	10,074		Y	City/Richland County	17,945	Y
MT	7	Wolf Point	LM Clayton	OLF	None	III	1,780	Y	Y	City/Roosevelt County	13,879	Y
NE	1	Chadron	Chadron Municipal	CDR	None	III	1,735	Y	Y	City	9,021	Y
NE	2	Kearney	Kearney Municipal	EAR	None	III	7,720	Y		City	24,396	Y
NM	1	Alamogordo	Alamogordo-White Sands	ALM	None	III	3,098	Y	Y	City	27,596	Y
NM	2	Carlsbad	Cavern City Air Terminal	CNM	None	III	7,787	Y		City	31,888	Y
NM	3	Gallup	Gallup Municipal	GUP	None	III	4,201	Y		City	19,154	Y
NM	4	Santa Fe	Santa Fe Municipal	SAF	None	III	26,178			City	55,859	
NM	5	Silver City	Grant County	SVC	None	III	3,192	Y	Y	Grant County	27,676	Y
ND	1	Dickinson	Dickinson Municipal	DIK	None	III	3,733	Y	Y	City	19,013	Y
OK	1	Ponca City	Ponca City Municipal	PHC	None	III	2,411	Y	Y	City	30,133	Y
TX	1	Brownwood	Brownwood Regional	BWD	None	III	1,699	Y	Y	City	24,874	Y
UT	1	Moab	Canyonlands Field	CHY	None	III	1,960	Y		Grand County	6,620	Y
UT	2	Vernal	Vernal	VEL	None	III	3,694	Y	Y	City/Uintah County	39,838	Y
WV	1	Bluefield	Mercer County	BLF	None	III	2,269	Y	Y	Mercer County	69,371	
AS	1	Fitiuta Village	Fitiuta	FAO	None	III	5,389	Y		American Samoa	56,911	
AS	2	Ofu Village	Ofu	ZO8	None	III	3,936	Y		American Samoa	56,911	
Class III Airport Totals												
- No. of Airports:					37							
- No. of Airports with < 10,000 Enplanements:					31							
- No. of Airports that are Small Entities:					29							
- No. of EAS Airports:					23							
Source: Data Provided by:												
1. FAA												
2. U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Census												
											07/01/2001	

Appendix III-4 Final Rule Class IV Airports, March 2001												Page 1 of 1	
State	No.	Associated City	Airport		Current Certification Status		CY-1999	<10,000	EAS	Airport Ownership	Population-1990	Small Entity	
			Name	ID	Current	Proposed Class	Enplaned Passengers	Enplaned Passengers					
AK	1	Five Mile	Five Mile	FVM	Limited	IV	7	Y		BLM Pipeline Office	248,709,873		
AK	2	Galbraith Lake	Galbraith Lake	GBH	Limited	IV	1,200	Y		State of AK	550,043		
AK	3	Kuparuk	Ugno-Kuparuk	UBV	Limited	IV	36	Y		ARCO AK, Inc.	N.A.		
AK	4	Prospect Creek	Prospect Creek	PPC	Limited	IV	2,419	Y		State of AK	550,043		
AK	5	Red Dog	Red Dog	AED	Limited	IV	9,316	Y		Nana Reg. Corp, Inc.	N.A.		
AZ	1	Marana	Pinal Airpark	MZJ	None	IV	N.A.	Y		Pinal County	116,379		
CA	1	Mammoth Lakes	Mammoth Yosemite	MMH	None	IV	147	Y		Town of Mammoth Lakes	4,785	Y	
CA	2	Merced	Merced Municipal	MCE	None	IV	3,879	Y		City of Merced	56,216		
LA	1	Tallulah - Vicksburg	Vicksburg Tallulah Regional	TVR	Limited	IV	31	Y		Both Cities	26,866	Y	
MO	1	Cape Girardeau	Cape Girardeau Reg.	CGI	Limited	IV	10,390			City of Cape Girardeau	37,092	Y	
MO	2	Jefferson City	Jefferson City Mem.	JEF	Limited	IV	568	Y		City of Jefferson City	35,481	Y	
MO	3	Kaiser - Lake Ozark	Lee Fine Memorial	AIZ	Limited	IV	94	Y		State of MO	5,116,901		
MO	4	Kansas City	K C Downtown	MKC	Limited	IV	1,550	Y		City of Kansas City	443,829		
MO	5	Kirksville	Kirksville Reg.	IRK	Limited	IV	1,305	Y		City of Kirksville	17,152	Y	
MO	6	St. Joseph	Rosecrans Memorial	STJ	Limited	IV	221	Y		City of St. Joseph	71,852		
MO	7	St. Louis	Spirit of St. Louis	SUS	Limited	IV	10,720			St. Louis County	993,508		
NJ	1	Wildwood	Cape May County	VWD	Limited	IV	4	Y		Cape May County	95,089		
TH	1	Millington	Millington Municipal	NQA	Limited	IV	N.A.	Y		City of Millington	17,866	Y	
Class IV Airport Totals:													
Total Number of Class IV Airports					=	18							
Total Number of Small Entity Class IV Airports					=	6							
Percent of Class IV Airports Which Are Small Entities =						33.3%							
Number of Class IV Airports - Enplanements < 10,000 =						16							
Percent of Class IV Airports - Enplanements < 10,000 =						88.9%							
Source: Data Provided by:													
1. FAA													
2. U.S. Census Bureau 1990 Census													

04/02/2004